AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. IV.—MARCH, 1891.—NO. 3.

THEOLOGICAL MINIMIZING AND ITS LATEST DEFENDER.

(*Continued.*)

IV.

OUR MOTIVES.

"*Ferendus est disputator in aliis quæstionibus non diligenter digestis, nondum plena auctoritate Ecclesiæ firmatis; ibi ferendus est error, non tantum progredi debet, ut etiam fundamenta Ecclesiæ quatere moliatur.*" St. Augustin. Serm. 294, n. 17, S. 14 De Verb. Apost.

"We may allow," says the great Doctor of the Church whose words we quote, "we may allow in theology discussions on questions which have not yet been sufficiently explained, which have not yet been fully established by the authority of the Church. In such cases we may even tolerate error, provided however that this error does not go so far as to sap the very foundations of the Church." This rule is certainly broad enough. In fact it requires some words of explanation to understand what the great Doctor means by questions "nondum plena auctoritate Ecclesiæ firmatis." He gives us the following explanation in the context

of this quotation and in several other places in his writings, and his opinion is entirely in accord with that which the Church has clearly expressed on the liberty allowed Catholics, and especially theologians in matters of faith.[1] We take the words of the saint in the widest sense. We shall not controvert any opinion of Canon di Bartolo which a theologian is at full liberty to hold; we do not even intend, unless perhaps *en passant*, to touch some of his propositions, which seem to us to be outside of the sphere of free discussion, and moreover to be false and untenable. Following strictly the rule of St. Augustine, we shall strive to mark out those doctrines of Canon di Bartolo which seem to us *to sap the foundations of the Church*.—The Church is the "columna et firmamentum veritatis," she is the "infallibilis testis, magistra et judex veritatis." This is her divine mission, the reason of her existence, her very essence. Now we assert that the Criteria push minimizing to such an extent, attenuate Catholic truth to such a degree, that they destroy the very foundations of the Church, that is to say, *her infallibility*. We fully understand the gravity of this assertion. We do not forget what we said at the beginning of our first article:—"A theologian exaggerates when he applies to a doctrine a theological censure graver than that applied by the Church, or when he takes it on himself to censure opinions which may be held without any want of respect to the authority of the Church. In all these cases a theologian

[1] For a long time the maxim "In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas" has been cited in theological controversy. It is commonly ascribed to St. Augustine; but no one has ever yet given the place from which it is taken. The words are certainly beautiful and their wide use shows that everybody considers them so. However the maxim is used in every school of theology, in every camp of hostile opinions, and everybody interprets it in his own fashion. This proves that it can hardly be used as a rule, because a rule must be above all things clear and unequivocal. What does *necessarium* mean; and what are we to consider *dubia?* Protestants use it to bolster up their theory of "fundamentals;" the Liberal Catholic school in France, Germany, Belgium, employs it on a large scale, while Minimizers, especially Holden and Chrisman, proclaim it with great emphasis.

so acting will not escape the reproach of ignorance or arrogance."

We will go even farther and say that in the present case this ignorance or arrogance would be the more blameworthy and unpardonable because it touches so delicate a subject as the orthodoxy of doctrine. We must choose between two things:—either our assertion is groundless and the teaching of the Canon is perfectly orthodox, or at least not as erroneous as we contend; and then Canon di Bartolo has the right to accuse us of ignorant calumny, and we ask for no mercy; or our accusation is well grounded: and in this case every one will understand how important it is to expose such doctrine and by sounding a clear warning to put all Catholic readers, especially the young students of theology, on their guard. Justly do the latter desire to gain above all things an intimate knowledge of that Church to which they devote all the powers of their intellect, and all the aspirations of their souls. Their love for the Church, their zeal for her honor and glory will be in proportion to the knowledge which they have acquired of the Spouse of Christ, of the greatness and extent of her divine mission, and of her high prerogatives. To sow in these young hearts the least distrust of the Church, to teach them to criticise her doctrine, is to stifle the noblest emotions of ardent and generous souls, to chill their fervor with the frost of Jansenism,—to do the worst possible injury to the Church and to her ministers, and consequently to the faithful.

Canon di Bartolo is not a layman who might be easily pardoned a passing inexactness in the expression of theological truths; he has not set forth his doctrines as *obiter dicta* while treating of another subject; but he writes *ex professo* on these matters, he boldly declares that he means to give the true theological views, that he wishes to contribute to the "real progress" of theology. Yet he attacks explicitly and implicitly, on the most important questions, doctrines which are common to all Catholic theologians. Moreover, as

we have already said, this book becomes attractive at first sight by a certain originality in the statement of its propositions; besides, the dangerous doctrines are set forth in a very deceptive fashion and under the appearance of perfect orthodoxy. All this urges upon us to give our opinion in full sincerity and with all openness, to say frankly and without reservation what we believe to be the truth and the whole truth. Nature has refused us the gift of artfully hiding the expressions of severe criticism, and we are far from possessing the beauty of style which we should desire to use. We therefore hope that no one will judge our intentions or our arguments from our manner of expressing them, if that manner should at times recall Horace's "Homo sermonis amari." "*Veritas liberabit vos.*" *All for the Church and nothing against her*—these are the sentiments which guide us.

We do not intend to confine ourselves to a simple criticism of Canon di Bartolo's work. We will take advantage of the opportunity to place before our readers a clear exposition of the Catholic doctrine which forms the basis of our argumentation. In this way the examination of the book will be deeper and more useful; for we understand a doctrine better, enter more profoundly into its spirit and express it with more precision when we have before our eyes a practical example of its denial or attenuation (minimizing).

In order to avoid in this discussion any wild or ill grounded charge, we shall be careful to formulate distinctly our objections against the author's theology. In the first question which now occupies our attention we shall state why and how Canon di Bartolo's teaching appears to undermine the foundations of the infallibility of the Church.

The French translation of the "Criteri" was authorized by the Vicar-general of Rhodes, only with the significant restriction: "*Imprimatur cum notis ab interprete additis.*" In these notes, at the end of the book, the translator takes with very good reason exceptions to several doctrines of the Canon, as f. i. on Transformism, Ontologism, but notably also on the chapters with which we are concerned. Thus he finds that the question of the temporal power of the Pope is "très-grave," and adds very aptly: "The Sovereign Pontiff is the *only competent judge.*" He also

reminds the reader that Bartolo's doctrine on dogmatic facts is "repoussée par la grande majorité des théologiens anciens et la presque unanimité des modernes." The explanation which C. Bartolo gives of the *inspiration* of Holy Scripture, the translator thinks "très-dangereuse." This estimate is very just; but, to our mind, not quite enough. For C. di Bartolo has borrowed his theory on this question from *Holden*, a minimizer of the seventeenth century. Holden's theory when made public called forth at once universal indignation from all theologians. It is refuted in every manual of dogmatic theology as absolutely untenable and opposed to the definitions of the Councils of Florence, Trent, and the Vatican. Scheeben does not hesitate to call it *directly* opposed to dogma. But we repeat it, Bartolo's system is nothing else than *Holdenism*. The Council of the Vatican not having mentioned Holden by name (nor, for that matter, any other writers whose errors it condemned) Bartolo tells us that "this author has never been condemned by the Church;" and adopting his doctrine informs us that "he has corrected whatever is excessive in Holden's expressions,"—"l'asprezza" as the original has it. Indeed, Canon di Bartolo has changed the expression of the theory and disguised the latter under the mask of a *more orthodox terminology*, but 1, fundamentally, i. e., in *substance* Bartolo's theory is entirely the same as Holden's; 2, in fact, it is even *worse* than that of his master. Holden would at least not admit any errors in Sacred Writ, not even in those places which he held were not inspired. Bartolo maintains that the whole Scripture is inspired, but for matters which do not pertain to religion ("les matières d'ordre extra-religieux") he lights upon a *fallible* inspiration, which he calls a "*minimum of inspiration*," and remarks that "this minimum of inspiration gives no guarantee for the infallibility of the human co-operation" (namely, in writing the holy book). Full inspiration ("*le degré maximum d'inspiration*"), according to him, we find only "when the hagiographer speaks of doctrines of faith or morals, or when he narrates facts *essentially connected* ("en connexion essentielle") with those doctrines" (p. 247, ff.). This last thesis is pure Holdenism, as Dr. Hettinger remarks in his criticism of the first Italian edition of the "Criteri Teologici" (Literarische Rundschau, 1889, p. 327 ff.), where he adds that the "*inevitable consequence*" of this system is the theory favored by almost all modern Protestant theologians, namely, "that Holy Scripture *is not*, but only *contains* the word of God." Nay, according to Holdenism as formulated by C. di Bartolo, this could not even be said of all that is *contained* in Holy Writ. For outside of the sphere of doctrines on faith and morals or of essential facts, he admits error and falsehood in the Scriptures. (Bartolo has no right to cite in favor of this opinion the theologian Schaefer, who clearly states his contrary opinion on p. 89 of his book, Bibel und Wissenschaft). Bartolo's "correction" of Holden's 'harshness' consists, therefore, in adopting first the manifestly false theory of this minimizer concerning inspiration, and secondly, in rendering it still more dangerous by assertions, against which Holden himself strongly protests when he says in his 'Analysis fidei:' "falsitatis arguere non licet, *quidquid* habetur in sacro codice." Not only theology, but logic itself protests against our author's theory; for a *divine fallible inspiration* is simply a 'contradictio in adjecto.'

The French translator rejects no less Canon Bartolo's ideas concerning the public right or law of the Church; he finds there doctrines opposed "au sentiment commun;" others upon which he makes "ses *reserves les plus formelles*," because they seem to him "difficilement conciliables avec le sentiment catholique" (p. 331 ff.). Perfectly true! for the ideas of the French *Regalistæ*, reflected in our author's theses, can absolutely not be reconciled with the Catholic sentiment so clearly expressed in many decisions of the teaching Church.

We really cannot see why the translator, a priest of the Oratory of Rennes, should have considered it worth the trouble to make the 'Criteri' accessible to the public at large, when he found it necessary to make formal reserves and objections to doctrines so important. We are bold to add: 'ne bis in idem!' and venture the hope that our confrères of America and England will save us from a similar importation.

V.

CANON DI BARTOLO AND THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

Taking for granted what we have said in our first paper, p. 127, that Catholics must believe *fide divina*, i. e., *propter auctoritatem Dei revelantis*, truths revealed by God, and that they must believe *fide ecclesiastica*, or *mediate divina*, that is to say, *propter revelatam infallibilem auctoritatem Ecclesiæ*, what she defines as true, though not revealed; supposing this, we will sum up our argument as follows:—The very foundation of the infallibility of the Church is undermined when we deny that infallibility in matters in which the Church supposes herself infallible. Because "it is the prerogative of the supreme power possessing divine authority to determine the *extent* of its own infallibility and the *objects* upon which it is qualified to exercise it . . . Whenever it actually makes a judgment, it implicitly determines that the object of the same is within its province . . . An infallible authority must know the limits of its revealed message. If authority can make a mistake in determining its own limits, it may make a mistake in a matter of faith."[1]

The basis of the full and entire submission, interior and exterior, which is due from the faithful to all the definitions

[1] Very Rev. A. Hewit, in "The Divine Authority of the Church," *Catholic World*, XLII, 1885: p. 160. See our first paper, n. III, p. 123, 124.

of the Church, is swept away, and the obligation of the *assensus fidei ecclesiasticæ* is destroyed, by denying the duty of this adhesion of the intelligence—of this act of faith, in decisions for which the church demands it from all her children. (See above p. 117.)

Infallibility is denied to many decrees proposed by the teaching Church, by Councils and Popes as infallible decisions and accepted by the faithful as such; doubt is cast on all the condemnations pronounced by the supreme teaching authority of the church on heresies or errors whether contained in writings or laid down in specified propositions; a means is furnished to disobedient catholics and even to heretics to admit the infallibility of the church in theory and to deny it in practice; approval is given to the famous distinction of the Jansenists between the right and the fact; finally, to sum up the whole matter in a few words, the church is robbed of her prerogative of "*Magistra* et *Judex* veritatis" and is reduced to the rôle of a mere "*Testis Veritatis*":—when it is laid down as a theological principle, that the domain of the infallibility of the church is only revelation in the strict sense of the word; that the church can deliver an infallible judgment only on doctrines or facts which have been explicitly or implicitly revealed; that she does not possess the gift of infallibility in definitions which have for their object doctrines or facts not revealed, but only connected with revelation.

"Quare merito," says Card. Mazzella, "Fénélon demonstrat, '*hac sublata infallibilitate* (namely in facts dogmatic, and especially: ecclesiæ declarantis orthodoxiam vel heterodoxiam propositionum in sensu auctoris objectivo) *totam ruere infallibilitatem Ecclesiæ;* decipi enim semper posset in intelligendis textibus Patrum, in intelligendis propositionibus hæreticorum, decretis Conciliorum; ac proinde posset præbere ut hæreticam doctrinam, quæ reipsa orthodoxa est, aut e converso judicare uti orthodoxam doctrinam, quæ sit hæretica, et sic eludi posset quodvis Ecclesiæ judicium. Ex hoc

præterea fieret, ut infallibilitas Ecclesiæ *theoretice* semper admitteretur, *practice* semper eluderetur; omnia illius anathemata lata in doctrinam, quam judicavit hæreticam, ex. gr. Nestorii, Pelagii, Lutheri, Calvini, essent inane terriculum; tunc ipsa inermis, et succiso censuræ nervo, imbecillis jaceret; unde portæ inferi prævalerent adversus eam. Hæc autem omnia exemplis illustrat." (*De Religione et Ecclesia*, p. 632.)

Now on the one hand, the Church has always claimed and still does claim the authority to decide infallibly on questions of doctrine or fact which though not revealed, are connected with revelation; therefore she has always obliged and still obliges her children to give a full outward and inward assent, a true *assensum fidei* (fidei mediate divinæ or ecclesiasticæ) to these decisions; she thus teaches by the very fact of her decisions, that her infallibility, revealed by God, extends to these same matters. Thus, for example, the first councils condemned as heretical not only the doctrines of heretics, but also their writings: the Council of Nice proscribes the "Thalia" by Arius; the bishops at the Council of Ephesus solemnly declare that they condemn not only the heresy of Nestorius but also his epistle which contained it, "omnes Nestorii epistolam et dogmata anathematizamus"; the fifth general Council condemns the "Three Chapters" and flings anathema at those who dared to defend "impia conscripta Theodoreti." The Council of Constance, approved in this matter by Martin V., condemns 45 articles of Wycliffe, and 30 of Huss, and obliges all the faithful to condemn them; whoever is suspected of his faith is to be examined "utrum *credat*, Wicliff et.... fuisse hæreticos et *libros eorum fuisse et esse perversos*." At the time of Jansenism, Pope Innocent X., condemned the famous five propositions contained in the book "Augustinus" by Jansenius "in sensu ab auctore intento," i. e., in sensu objectivo; and the French clergy were bound to sign the formula: "ore et corde sensum quinque propositionum in ejus libro contentarum con-

demno." Alexander VII., again condemned the propositions "in sensu ab eodem Cornelio intento," and in the new oath which every prelate had to sign, he affirmed "me esse obligatum in conscientia" and "in sensu ab auctore intento damno." To pass over all the other examples furnished in the history of the Church to support our proposition, we will only call attention to the words of the Vatican Council: "Ecclesiæ. . . . jus etiam et officium divinitus habet, falsi nominis scientiam proscribendi." (Const de fidé cath. c. iv.)[1]

On the other hand "les Critères théologiques" explicitly deny the infallibility which the Church claims for herself. Canon di Bartolo teaches in many places that "the magisterium of the church has for its *sole domain* revelation," (p. 39) that this magistracy cannot define infallibly doctrines or facts "*which are not found explicitly or implicitly in revelation*," (p. 65); the "Critères" denies the infallibility of the Church not only on some specific dogmatic fact (as for example the canonization of the saints), but it lays it down as a *theological principle* that the Church is *fallible generally in all questions of facts, in all her decisions on dogmatic facts.* (58 seq.) Canon di Bartolo declares not only implicitly, but also explicitly enough that the *Jansenists defended the true doctrine* on this capital point; he even says in express terms, in spite of all the contrary decrees of the popes, in spite of the assent given by the Bishops to these decrees, that the Church could not declare infallibly "*that the book of Jansenius sins against orthodoxy* (p. 65); he does not admit, that the faithful should respond to such definitions by an *act of faith*, due to the infallible teaching of the church! (ibid. et passim.)

VI.

CANON DI BARTOLO AND THE CATHOLIC THEOLOGIANS.

Let us look at this same question from another point of view. The common and constant consent of theologians

[1] See also below, where we treat *ex professo* on the object of the infallibility of the Church.

when they state that a doctrine must be held by all the faithful, is one of the criteria of divine tradition, a legitimate witness of the teaching of the magistracy of the church. We cannot deny such a doctrine without weakening the authority of the teaching Church herself. It was for this reason that Pius IX., declared in his celebrated letter of Dec. 21, 1863, addressed to the archbishop of Munich: "Sed cum agatur de ea subjectione, qua ex conscientia ii omnes catholici adstringuntur, qui in scientias contemplatrices incumbunt, ut novas suis scriptis Ecclesiæ afferant utilitates, idcirco ejusdem conventus viri agnoscere debent, *sapientibus catholicis haud satis esse, ut præfata dogmata recipiant ac venerentur, verum etiam opus esse ut se subjiciant. . . . iis doctrinæ capitibus, quæ communi et constanti theologorum catholicorum consensu retinentur ut theologicæ veritates et conclusiones ita certæ, ut opiniones iisdem doctrinæ capitibus adversæ, quamquam hæreticæ dici nequeant, tamen aliam theologicam mereantur censuram.*" (Acta S. Sedis, vol. viii, p. 436. ff.)

Now according to the common and constant consent of theologians the infallibility of the Church in the definition of dogmatic facts, in all that regards the "depositum late sumptum" is a "certain *theological truth*;" the opposed doctrine is commonly characterised as "*gravissimus error.*" And yet Canon di Bartolo formally denies this infallibility of the Church, and he professes to teach this most grievous error, and that under the name of true theology!

The consent of theologians on this question is so unanimous that one of the deepest theologians of the Vatican Council, Mgr. Gasser, Bishop of Brixen (Austria) speaking in the name of the "dogmatic deputation" said before the whole council:—"At vero cum veritatibus revelatis veritates aliæ magis vel minus stricte cohærent, quæ licet in se revelatæ non sint, requirantur tamen ad ipsum depositum revelationis integre custodiendum, rite explicandum et efficaciter definiendum. Hujusmodi igitur veritates, ad quas utique etiam per se pertinent facta dogmatica, quatenus

sine his depositum fidei custodiri et exponi non posset, hujusmodi inquam veritates, *non quidem per se ad depositum fidei, sed tamen ad custodiam depositi fidei spectant.* HINC OMNES OMNINO CATHOLICI THEOLOGI CONSENTIUNT, *Ecclesiam in hujusmodi veritatum authentica propositione ac definitione esse infallibilem*, ita ut hanc infallibilitatem negare GRAVISSIMUS ESSET ERROR. Sed opinionum diversitas versatur unice circa gradum certitudinis, utrum scilicet infallibilitas in hisce veritatibus proponendis, ac proinde in erroribus per censuras nota hæreseos inferiores proscribendis debeat censeri dogma fidei, ut hanc infallibilitatem Ecclesiæ negans esset hæreticus; an solum sit veritas in se non revelata sed ex revelato dogmate deducta, ac proinde solum theologice certa."[1]

The question of the infallibility of the Church was treated in the first dogmatic constitution 'De Ecclesia Christi,' principally with regard to the *subject* of this infallibility. The object is only generally stated by declaring that the *object* of the Pope's infallibility is *the same* as the object of the infallibility of the Church: "R. P. . . . *ea* infallibilitate pollere, qua divinus Redemptor *Ecclesiam suam* in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit." The more precise determination of the object of infallibility was reserved for the second constitution 'de Ecclesia.' The Council would have taken it into consideration immediately after the definition of the first if the unhappy circumstances, which every one knows, had not hindered its continuance. The preliminary labors of the theological commission and the 'dogmatic committee' were already finished, and here is how the schema proposed to define the object of infallibility:—Objectum igitur infallibilitatis tantum patere docemus, quantum fidei patet depositum *et ejus custodiendi officium postulat*; adeoque praerogativam infallibilitatis, qua Christi Ecclesia pollet, ambitu suo complecti *tum* universum Dei verbum revelatum, *tum* id omne, quod licet in se revelatum non sit, est tamen ejusmodi,

[1] Acta et decreta conciliorum, Coll. Lac., vii, p. 415.

sine quo illud tuto conservari, certo ac definitive ad credendum proponi et explicari, aut contra errores hominum et falsi nominis scientiæ oppositiones valide asseri defendique non possit." Acta l. c. p. 570, cap. IX.

The "Acta" also show that in the definition of the infallibility of the Pope *terms* were chosen which are equally applicable to the infallibility of a definition of dogmatic facts: "Cum doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa ecclesia *tenendam* definit." They designedly avoided such expressions 'cum *dogma* proponit,' or 'cum doctrinam ut *revelatam* proponit,' or 'cum doctrinam *fide divina* credendam proponit,' or 'cum contrarium ut *hæreticam* damnat.' We do not say, therefore, that the infallibility of the Church in dogmatic facts has been defined by the council, as some, e. g. Andries in Germany, have maintained; but only that the Council proposed to define it, and that in the definition on the subject of infallibility it has indicated the object in a general way, making however use of such expressions, as, far from excluding dogmatic facts rather include them. In any case the acts of the Council furnish a *peremptory* argument on the *sensus* et *consensus Ecclesiæ* relative to the subject under discussion.

Why did the author of the 'Criteri,' when he proposed to write for the Catholic world a new 'Regula fidei,' a guide in Catholic doctrine, not consult the schemata of the Vatican Council and the lengthy discussions of its theologians, in order to know the consentient mind of Catholic Theology? These Schemata he could have read in Bishop Martin's collections, to which he himself refers; the schemata together with the observations of the fathers and the theologians of the Council were at hand in the collections published by Friedberg and by Friedrich.

Besides, Canon di Bartolo was acquainted with the important letter of Pius IX., mentioned above. He quotes it in two places, p. 41 and 141, and calls it a "remarkable letter;" but each time he only cites the *preceeding passage*

referring to dogmatic doctrines which must be believed *fide divina*, and stops at the "*Sed*" of the phrase which follows immediately, just as we saw him in a former citation from the "Civiltà."

Canon di Bartolo quotes, *after the same fashion*, theologians who declare that the doctrine of the Criteria is a very grave error. All naturally teach that we must believe all dogmas *fide divina*; all add that *the rule of faith does not stop here.* But Canon Bartolo's rule of faith recognizes only dogmas, and the "fides divina proprie dicta," which is due them. He excludes everything else, and yet he *quotes for the support of his teaching those very theologians who protest loudly against this restriction.* The artifice consists in giving only a portion of their doctrine, and in preserving a 'discreet silence' on the remainder. Thus on p. 41 Canon Bartolo says: "The learned theologian Heinrich sets forth in the following terms the idea of the Church's teaching." Then follows a literal version in German of the words of the Vatican Council: 'fide divina et catholica ea omnia credenda' etc., and the explanation which Heinrich gives of it. But this very learned theologian and deep lover of the Church and of her teachings, does not give, as Bartolo implies in this place the idea of the "teaching church." He speaks of the rule of faith in general which he gives in the words of the Council. The concept of "the teaching church he gives in chap. 5 under the clear heading "*The church, the infallible teacher, judge and proximate rule of faith.*" He warns the reader that this is "the *most important point of the rule of faith*" and puts him on his guard against the "disastrous errors" of those who "construe and measure this fundamental point according to human views, modern ideas or political analogies." (II, 158). Heinrich afterwards exactly determines the object of infallibility (p. 534–608) and nearly every one of his theses contains a solid refutation of the 'criteria' on this point, and proves that the "idea of the teaching church" given by Bartolo is false, erroneous, contrary to the Catholic senti-

ment, and that Bartolo's propositions merit a theological censure more or less grave. We do not wish to give a name to this method of 'proving' the criteria by quotations—the most severe judgment on it would be to indicate the school which cultivated it to a masterly degree;—we will simply state that on this fundamental point Canon di Bartolo 'constructs' the doctrine of the church truly "himself" without the Church and contrary to the sentiment of the Church.

On page 55 Canon di Bartolo quotes the following sentence from Hettinger's "Fundamental Theologie":—"All theologians agree in the assertion that truths deduced from premises one of which is revealed and the other known from reason only, are not of divine faith, because "conclusio sequitur debiliorem partem." But he refrains from placing before his readers what the great theologian adds *in the same* place:—"No theologian denies that a truth thus deduced can be infallibly proposed by the Church as a truth *de fide*. (Conc. Vatic. de Eccl. c. iv: doctrinam. . . . tenendam). We believe these propositions *fide mediate divina* seu ecclesiastica because their truth is guaranteed by the testimony of the infallible Church. See Lugo, Suarez etc." (op. cit. 765). In this same chapter Hettinger explains the object of the infallibility of the Church; he especially proves the extension of this infallibility to dogmatic facts in general and in particular, pp. 768–782. He considers his doctrine so certain that the only adversaries he names are the Jansenists "who were the first to distinguish between the right and the fact in order to prove the incompetence of the Church to condemn the ("Augustinus");" and the *Hermesians* "who have tried in our times to defend the doctrines of their master by the same reasons" (l. c. 772).

VII.

CANON DI BARTOLO'S COMPLIMENT TO CATHOLIC THEOLOGIANS.

Here we may be permitted to ask a question. How does it come to pass that Canon di Bartolo never tells his readers that all the great theologians of our days, whom he quotes with such *aplomb*—if with so little relevancy,—do not share his opinion? That on the contrary all call it a very grave error?—That this very grave error is called by all an invention of the *Jansenists*, a specimen of the famous theology of Port Royal, of which Arnauld and Nicole were the prophets? The theologians of Port Royal made it a specialty to speak "in the name of all theologians;" for in their eyes there were no theologians outside their school. They held by the same title a monopoly of *Logic*. Thence came that ridiculous arrogance with which Nicole writes: "*The opinion that we must believe the Church in the definition of dogmatic facts, is contrary to the opinions of all theologians and cannot be sustained* without shame and infamy.[1]

Leaving aside all the odium connected with that traitorous sect, since Canon di Bartolo is convinced that *on this point* Nicole and his party were right in principle, why does he not say frankly and clearly to the Catholic theologians:—It is you who are deceived; you accuse the Jansenists of having invented a new theory on infallibility, you call the proposition which I uphold a very grave error, some of you even call it heresy;[2] it is you modern theologians who

[1] "L'opinion, qu'on doit en croire l'Eglise sur un fait dogmatique, est une erreur contraire aux sentiments de tous les théologiens et *qu'on ne peut soutenir sans honte et sans infamie*!" Lettres sur l'hérésie imaginaire, l. 6. p. 10. See De Maistre, De l'Eglise Gallicane, c. ix.

[2] "Hæc extensio infallibilitatis omnibus theologis consentientibus veritas est theologica ita certa, ut ejus negatio error esset gravissimus, vel ex plurium sententia etiam hæresis, quamvis hactenus explicite hæreseos damnata non sit." Franzelin, de traditione, p, 123. This "eminent Theologian" as Canon di Bartolo justly calls him cites among the older theologians Lugo, Bañez, Suarez, etc.

have fallen into a very grave error, you who defend an anti-Catholic doctrine which your predecessors invented in the seventeenth century. It is you, Perrone, Franzelin, Mazzella, Hergenröther, Hettinger, Heinrich, etc., who do not understand this capital dogma of the infallibility of the Church." Canon di Bartolo's thesis that the Church is fallible in questions of fact, a very shibboleth of his, appears under one form or another not less than twenty times in his book. The author explains his mind more clearly in pp. 58–67; there he insinuates that this thesis of the "Jansenists and Quesnellists" was true and their only blame that "*they insolently abused* this doctrine, according to which the Church is fallible in question of fact." "The Catholic theologians,' continues Bartolo, "were *frightened* by it, and *doing violence to their convictions*—though with the best of intentions—entrenched themselves in the opposite doctrine" (p. 63). Two pages farther on he says:—*In order to affirm that a fact is the object of infallibility, because it is connected with the right, one must also maintain that it is found explicitly or implicitly in revelation. But who will seriously maintain that we find in revelation that Arius was a heretic—that Francis of Assisi is a saint —that the relics of the true cross at Jerusalem and Rome are authentic*, (*!!*)—THAT THE BOOK OF JANSENIUS OFFENDS AGAINST ORTHODOXY. *Let us stick close to the principles of logic and the harmony of doctrines so that Catholic Revelation may be more easily accepted by our separated brethren.* (p. 65)

We shall return to this page which is in our eyes one of the most regrettable in the whole book, as much for what it asserts or insinuates as for the consequences which flow from it,—as well for what is contained in the assertion as for the manner of arguing, to describe which the word superficial is certainly not too strong. We shall also speak of the *Church of the Future*, in which we must reunite with our separated brethren and of the "*Theological Communionism*" which according to the ideas of Canon di Bartolo—typified, we are forced to say, in Doellinger—must prepare the way for the "*Full Religion of the Future.*"

But we must here limit ourselves to the compliment paid by Canon di Bartolo to Catholic theologians. With regard to the Catholic theologians of the times of the Jansenists, he says:—The Jansenists made a distinction between the right and the fact: this was logical. They taught that Pope Innocent X., could not condemn Jansenius's Book by an infallible judgment: this was equally logical; because this fact is "neither explicitly nor implicitly revealed," and on the other hand, "logic" and "the harmony of doctrine" clearly teach that the only object of infallibility is "revelation." The Pope therefore claimed an infallibility which does not belong to him. What were Catholic theologians to do? They could only reply: You Arnauld, Nicole, Pascal, you are right: you are by no means bound to believe that Jansenius's book is unorthodox. But do not "insolently" abuse this doctrine, do not insult the Pope and the bishops, who order you to believe and who oblige you to sign formulæ containing this act of faith. Stand for your rights and your doctrine "in a becoming manner" "without any spirit of rebellion." (Bartolo's style!) But what did happen? Catholic theologians did not have the courage to take up the defense of truth and of what they knew to be the truth. "Frightened"[1] (By the Pope? or by the bishops?) they "*did violence*" to their beliefs—which simply means that they embraced a doctrine, erroneously proposed as a Catholic doctrine, and taught with Pope and bishops that it should be believed while they knew well that this doctrine was false! Instead of becoming Jansenists—at least on this point—as was the dictate of their conscience, "they entrenched themselves in the opposite doctrine," and preached a lie! The only excuse which they have in the face of

[1] All the faithful children of the church all, the theologians were "frightened," to hear Catholics call the authority of their mother in question: they were frightened at the novelty of a doctrine opposed to tradition and the sentiment of the faithful. They were frightened to see hypocrites revolt against the church while proclaiming themselves her devoted sons.

history is the "purity of their motives!"—They did evil to draw good out of it believing that this end justified even the betrayal of truth.

And the later theologians? How does it happen that they continued and still continue teaching the same doctrine? There can be but one explanation: that since then treason and hypocrisy have become common in the Church. Theologians one after another have "done violence" to themselves and have embraced the opposite doctrine in spite of their convictions. Or else they have finished by taking their predecessors' word for it and without caring for logic, or the harmony of doctrine or revelation, they have become the champions of error, "the illustrious Perrone," the "eminent Franzelin," the "learned Heinrich," at their head.

Conclusion: Let us therefore correct not only dogmatic theology but also history. Up to this we have always believed that the Jansenists distinguished themselves not only in insolence but also in hypocrisy.[1] Canon di Bartolo informs us that their only fault was insolence; that it is Catholic theologians who should be stigmatized as hypocrites. With regard to the theologians of the nineteenth century if they teach the infallibility of the church in dogmatic facts without "doing violence to their convictions," if they have come to see no more the want of logic and of harmony in their doctrines, they still owe thanks to Canon di Bartolo who forgives them their ignorance or at least does not reproach them openly with it; who even carries his condescension so far as to heap praises on them and to quote them —in his own way—on almost every page of his work!

(*To be continued.*)

J. SCHROEDER.

[1] Well described by De Maistre, l. c. chapter iii: "Le Jansenisme, portrait de la secte."

THE POET OF PASSION-TIDE.

In his own verse the poet still we find,
In his own page his memory lives enshrined,
As in their amber sweets the smothered bees,—
As the fair cedar, fallen before the breeze,
Lies self-enbalmed amidst mouldering trees.

O. W. Holmes.

WE shall indeed find our poet, Venantius Fortunatus, in his own verse. It furnishes us with the details of the poet's life, and with the pleasant views we catch of that simple, cultured, tender, sparkling, and devout soul that runs, a plainly discovered undercurrent, in the flow of his rapid numbers. But his poetry is more to us than a record of the man—it is a record of the times in which he lived. His works are valuable as historical documents, giving us many details of the lives of bishops and princes whose names (to borrow a thought of Cicero's) would have sunk into the oblivion of the same tomb that covered their bodies, if Fortunatus had not played for them the part of another Homer.[1] So that it has been said that nearly all the writers who have touched the history of France in the sixth century have drawn from this fount. He is a prominent figure in the pages of those who would trace the growth of our modern civilization out of the wreck of ancient splendors. An Italian by birth, a Roman in taste, tradition, and culture, he carried, like Æneas of old, his household gods into a new land; and the rude courts of the Franks listened to the voice of the exile chanting the songs of a new order to the melodies of the old civilization. In hymnology, he is the link that binds the ages of Prudentius and Sedulius to those of Notker, Herman-

[1] Quocirca tuto illud affirmare possim, plurimi jam sive episcoporum illius temporis, sive procerum regni Galliæ nomina ac res gestæ perpetua in oblivione jacuissent, nisi eadem suis litteris Fortunatus seræ posteritati prodidisset.—Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, T. 88, p. 11.

nus Contractus, and St. Bernard. He has been styled "the last of the classics." Important as the poet becomes to us when viewed in these lights, he is drawn nearer to us and made more familiar as the author of the two grand Passion hymns, *Vexilla regis prodeunt*, and *Pange lingua gloriosi prælium certaminis*. This Passion season has suggested a translation of the hymns, together with a slight sketch of the author's life.

Venantius Honorius Clementianus Fortunatus was born about the year 530, near Ceneda, in Treviso; perhaps, if we may judge from passages in his writings, of somewhat distinguished parentage. We naturally find him a student at Ravenna, which under Theodoric the Ostrogoth, had become a centre of literary culture as it had been of political activity. There he applied himself to grammar, rhetoric, and poetry, and touched the subject of jurisprudence. In his life of St. Martin of Tours he sings thus of himself and his early studies:

> Ast ego sensus inops, Italæ quota portio linguæ?
> Fæce gravis, sermone levis, ratione pigrescens,
> Mente hebes, arte carens, usu rudis, ore nec expers,
> Parva grammaticæ lambens refluamina guttæ,
> Rhetoricæ exiguum prælibans gurgitis haustum,
> Cote ex juridica, cui vix rubigo recessit,
> Quæ prius addidici, dediscens, et cui tantum
> Artibus ex illis odor est in naribus istis:
> Non prætexta mihi rutilat toga, pennula nulla;
> Jam mea nuda fames superest de paupere lingua.

We must not interpret this modest dispraise of self too literally. It is a characteristic trait of our poet to lavish a wealth of praises on the mediocre talent of his friends, and to pass harsh criticisms on himself. He has been censured by unsympathetic biographers for the exaggerated encomiums he bestows on his fellows. But if we interpret his praise of others by his self-dispraise, we shall perchance discover in him that simple modesty which is peculiar to gifted souls

Let us add that if an exacting criticism find herein an insufficient apology for the too complimentary phrases in which he abounds, possibly a more benignant interpretation would find in the prevailing customs of that age a sufficient exoneration. We may, with Cardinal Luchi, dissent from Brower's opinion, that Fortunatus was not well versed in letters at that time. [1]

For that could scarcely have been other than a devoted and earnest apprenticeship to the arts of poetry and eloquence which made Fortunatus a foremost man of letters of his day, and which made it possible for him to bequeath to posterity some highly finished and artistic poems. And now we come to a period of his life filled, not with the tranquil silences of study, but with restless wanderings through many lands. Perhaps the shadow of the Lombards was darkening the political skies of Italy,—that land so long given up to invasion after invasion, conquest after conquest. Ravenna, lying in the midst of its protecting lagoons, reached a sad eminence in the history of the time, as being well-nigh impregnable to a naval armament, and a very desirable stronghold for conqueror or besieged. The memories of Honorius, of Odoacer, of Theodoric, and of Belisarius were not memories of peace —it must be the prize of the fresh horde of Alboin. With Goldsmith he might have said :

> To kinder skies, where gentler manners reign,
> I turn ; and France displays her bright domain.

Still, it is probable that our poet, *meliora sperans*, contemplated only a temporary exile, until the storm should have passed over. While the political disturbances of the times

[1] Hinc opinatur Browerus, c. 2 *Vitæ Fort., ita illum leviter litteris imbutum fuisse, ut neque togam prætexatam, publice gestimuneris insigne unquam adeptu ssit, neque pennulam docendi causa sumpserit.* At multo verisimilius est Fortunatum, præ animi modestia ac propositæ vitæ instituto, ultro ab illis, si qui erant, honoribus abstinuisse, quam hominem non vulgari ingenio nec mediocri doctrina præstantem illa honorum insignia, quæ plerisque patebant, pro scientiæ tenuitate et litterarum inopia assequi non potuisse.—Luchi.

might have been a partial reason for leaving Italy, they very likely but furnished a last argument for the immediate fulfilling of a vow which Venantius had made to visit the tomb of St. Martin of Tours, there to offer thanks for a miraculous cure wrought for him through that Saint's intercession.[1] In his pilgrimage thither he visited many circles of Gallo-Roman culture, and enjoyed the fellowship of many distinguished personages, before he knelt to fulfill his loving duty to the great patron of Tours. Like Goldsmith, he had but the spirit of Poesy for boon companion; but, unlike Goldsmith, he could remember no place.

> . . . . . where the rude Carinthian boor
> Against the houseless stranger shuts the door:

everywhere he was received with the most flattering courtesies. Of him could be said what Cicero said of Archias: "All men who had skill in discerning genius thought him worthy of fellowship and hospitality." Nay, he tells himself how the rough children of the North caught up his improvised verses with greatest satisfaction.[2] Filled with wonder at the number of princes and great men whose friendship he gained in his exile, Liruti would seek an explanation of his success in some nobility of birth; but Luchi's surmise is more probable, as well as more favorable to the poet.[3]

[1] Suffering, while at Ravenna, from some serious affection of the eyes, he determined to seek help from St. Martin, to whose memory an altar was dedicated in the basilica of the martyrs SS. John and Paul. He hastened to the church, reverently anointed his eyes with oil taken from a lamp that burned before a picture of the saint, and found the cure he so ardently wished for.

[2] Thierry, who, however, is no admirer of Fortunatus, says very graphically: Les Barbares l'admiraient et faisaient de leur mieux pour se plaire a ses jeux d'esprit (Fort. lib. I., Proem ad Greg. Turon.): ses plus minces opuscules, des billets debout pendant que le porteur attendait, de simples dystiques improvisés à table, couraient de main en main, lus, copiés, appris par cœur; ses poëmes réligieux et ses pièces de vers addressées aux rois étaient un objet d'attente publique.—*Récits des Temps Mérovingiens*, Récit 5me.

[3] Atque in hoc ipso per Germaniam et Galliam itinere cum nobilissimis ac virtute et honore præstantibus viris amicitiam inire, ac eorum sibi gratiam promereri, facile potuit, cum ob vitæ innocentiam ac morum suavitatem, tum ob laudem litterarum

In the year 567 we find Venantius at the court of Sigebert, the eldest son of Hlothar or Clotaire, to whom, when the Frankish kingdom was divided, Austrasia, lying, roughly, between the Meuse and the Rhine, was given. Here he wrote an *epithalamium* for the nuptials of Sigebert and Brunehilda. Shortly afterwards he went to Tours, knelt at the tomb of St. Martin, and formed a close friendship with S. Euphronius, then bishop of Tours. But now that his devotion was satisfied, instead of returning to Italy, he proceeded to Poitiers, where he spent, with some interruption, the rest of his life. We can easily find a reason for his continued absence from Italy in the disturbances to which Treviso and the neighboring regions, "positæ in ipsius Germaniæ ore ac faucibus," were peculiarly exposed. Another reason, too, is that which he gives himself:

> Martinum cupiens, voto Radegundis adhæsi,
> Quam genuit cœlo terra Toringa sacro.

Indeed, it is not strange that he should have been invited to visit the convent at Poitiers, and so won the esteem of St. Radegunda.[1] Herself a scholar, a reader of the Latin and Greek Fathers, and by the rule of the convent a constant student, she quickly recognized of what service to her own

et ingenii, in primis vero ex quadam Musarum commendatione, quæ vel peregrinos et ignotos homines exteris nationibus probare semper consuevit.—Luchi, in *Proleg. ad Ven.*, etc.

[1] A daughter of Berthar, a pagan king of the Thuringi, she received in early life a Christian education, and married Clothaire I. From the moment of her baptism she gave herself up to those practices of piety and mortification which adorned her whole life. When Clothaire caused her brother to be unjustly killed, she obtained leave to retire from the world into the seclusion of a religious life. She founded and endowed a large convent at Poitiers, over which she placed a holy virgin, Agnes, as abbess, while she herself performed in her turn the menial duties of convent life. She adopted the Rule of S. Cesarius of Arles, part of the provisions of which was a studious cultivation of letters: "Omnes literas discant. Omni tempore duabus horis, hoc est a mane usque ad horam secundam, lectioni vacent. Reliquo vero diei spatio faciant opera sua. . . . Reliquis vero in unum operantibus una de sororibus usque ad tertium legat."

progress in letters this scholar from the home of culture would prove. She saw, too, in him those qualities of modesty, simplicity, ability, and poetic feeling, which had so won the admiration of the outside world. Many of the shorter poems of Venantius were suggested by the thoughtful kindnesses of the abbess and St. Radegunda. These poems have made him the subject of much censure from modern critics. They are declared to be frivolous and puerile.[1] Still, the apologist might suggest that if sometimes his muse descends to chant the bread and butter of life in lordly Latin—*dulce est desipere in loco;* if he celebrates in profusion of evident hyperbole the kindness of his entertainers, he sinneth in a very, very large company, and might plead much precedent, and find complete exoneration in very much subsequent fashion. If his simplicity describes the details of his repast, he must not be construed too literally, abounding, as is his wont, in poetical hyperbole. And aside from the fact that the language of poetry is not that of mathematics, the age of Fortunatus is not ours, nor is the temperament of author and audience the same. But there is the higher excuse suggested by Ozanam, when he says: "perhaps these puerilities, which are not always

[1] E. g., Guizot, in his *History of Civilization*, says: The pieces addressed to St. Radegunda, or to the abbess Agnes, are incontestably those which best make known and characterize the turn of mind and the kind of poetry of Fortunatus. On these only shall I dwell. One is naturally led to attach to the relations of such persons the most serious ideas, and it is, in fact, under a grave aspect that they have been described; it has been mistakenly; do not suppose that I have here to relate some strange anecdote, or that his history is subject to the embarrassment of some scandal. Here is nothing scandalous, nothing equivocal, nothing which lends the slightest conjecture, to be met with in the relation between the bishop and the nuns of Poitiers; but they are of a futility, of a puerility, which it is impossible to overlook, for even the poems of Fortunatus are a monument of them. He then gives the titles of sixteen out of twenty-seven pieces addressed to S. Radegunda or to the abbess: to S. Radegunda, "upon violets," "upon flowers put on the altar," "upon flowers which he sent her," "S. Radegunda for her to drink wine;" to the abbess, "upon flowers," "upon chestnuts," "milk," "*idem*," "a repast," "sloes," "milk and other dainties," "eggs and plums," "a repast," "*idem*," "*idem*," "*idem*." He then gives two extracts in further confirmation.

without charm, were necessary in order to introduce Latin letters into the education of the ladies." [1]

It seems that Fortunatus was at first secretary of the convent. After some time he was ordained priest, and then became chaplain and almoner to the convent. His residence was not an idle one. Besides performing the duties of his position, he applied himself to philosophy and the ecclesiastical sciences, and wrote many Lives of Saints, an explanation of the Lord's Prayer, and other shorter pieces.[2] His merits of life and labor raised him finally to the See of Poitiers, where he died, about the year 609.

The judgments passed on his merits as a writer embrace extremes. Paul the Deacon[3] says of his poetry, "nulli poetarum secundus, suavi et diserto sermone composuit." Luchi thinks his poetry ahead of, and sometimes behind, the culture of the age in which he lived. Guizot says: "There is in many of these small lay and religious poems a good deal of imagination, of intellect, and animation." Duffield says, "he has written what will live with the best." Trench considers two or three of his poems "inconceivably superior to the mass out of which they are taken." His works show us something better, however, than mere literary facility; they show

[1] "Tandis que Radegonde la Thuringienne rassemble autour d'elle les filles des Francs pour les exercer aux méditations du christianisme, Fortunat la soutient de ses louanges, il la félicite de lire les Pères grecs et latins; c'est pour elle qu'il réserve ses plus gracieuses compositions. S'il lui addresse des vers pour déplorer le moment ou elle s'enferme dans sa cellule, et d'autres pour célébrer le jour ou elle en sort; des vers pour le remercier d'une jatte de lait, des vers en lui envoyant une corbeille de châtaignes, des vers avec des fleurs; il fallait peut-être ces puérilités, qui ne sont pas toujours sans charme, pour faire entrer les lettres latines dans l'éducation des femmes. "A. Fr. Ozanam, La Civilisation Chrétienne chez les Francs, ch. ix.

[2] His works include eleven books of *Miscellanea*, written mostly in elegiac verse, and on all kinds of subjects:—hymns, such as the *Vexilla regis*, the *Pange, lingua*, etc; twenty-eight *Epitaphia*; letters to various bishops, many of them being addressed to S. Gregory of Tours, etc.; he also wrote four books of a Life of St. Martin, in heroic verse, following the plan of the prose work of Sulpicius Severus; verse on the destruction of Thuringia; eleven Lives of Saints, of which the life of S. Radegunda is considered the best; an exposition of the Catholic Faith, etc

[3] *De Gestis Longobard.*, lib ii., cap. 13.

us tender piety, good-will towards all men, esteem and love for venerable personages; they are full of that sweet instinct of modesty which, baffling every suggestion of envy, can discern only the worth of others and the worthlessness of self. The ability of the scholar is veiled in the simplicity of the man; and virtues we know not of hide, doubtless, under the humility of the Christian. What else could explain the universal esteem in which he was held? his close fellowship with the best spirits of his time? his elevation to the see of Poitiers? or, finally, his canonized sanctity, which makes his memory a benediction for all time to the devout people of that diocese?

VEXILLA REGIS.

1. Vexilla regis prodeunt, Fulget crucis mysterium, Qua vita mortem pertulit Et morte vitam protulit.	Behold the banners of the king, The mystic splendors of the cross, Where on hath Life endurèd loss That He through death our Life might bring.
2. Quæ vulnerata lanceæ Mucrone diro criminum Ut nos lavaret sordibus, Manavit unda et sanguine.	The spear that pierced His sacred side Hath given gracious fountains birth; And blood and water bathe the earth, That we may wash in that blest tide.
3. Impleta sunt, quæ concinit David fideli carmine, Dicendo nationibus: Regnavit a ligno Deus.	Fulfilled is all the prophecy That David sang in faithful song, Unto the sleeping gentile throng— Lo! God hath reignèd from a tree!
4. Arbor decora et fulgida, Ornata regis purpura, Electa, digno stipite Tam sancta membra tangere.	O Tree, all splendorous and fair, With the king's purple all bedecked, Worthy and noble, sole elect The Saviour's sacred limbs to bear!
5. Beata, cujus brachiis Pretium pependit sæculi; Statera facta corporis, Tulitque prædam tartari.	O blessed Tree, from whose wide arms Hung sinful man's Redemption great! O balance bearing Jesus' weight, To ransom us from hell's alarms!
6. O Crux, ave, spes unica, Hoc passionis tempore Piis adauge gratiam, Reisque dele crimina.	O Cross, our only hope, we pray, Pour out in blessed Passiontide New grace, where grace and love abide, And wash the sinner's stains away.

7. Te fons salutis Trinitas
Collaudet omnis spiritus,
Quibus crucis victoriam
Largiris, adde præmium. Amen.

Salvation's fountain, Trinity,
Let every spirit shout thy praise!
Give them reward of endless days,
Who by the cross win victory! Amen.

PANGE LINGUA.

1. Pange, lingua, gloriosi
Lauream certaminis,
Et super crucis trophæo
Dic triumphum nobilem,
Qualiter Redemptor orbis
Immolatus vicerit.

Sing, my tongue, the Saviour's battle,
Sing the crowning laurel wreath,
And the cross, the trophy-symbol,—
Sing it with triumphant breath,
How the world's Redeemer conquered
In the awful arms of death!

2. De parentis protoplasti
Fraude Factor condolens,
Quando pomi noxialis
In necem morsu ruit,
Ipse lignum tunc notavit,
Damna ligni ut solveret.

When the first of men had eaten
Death in the forbidden food,
Pitying the fall, his Maker,
Still all-merciful and good,
Chose the tree that should forever
Lift the evil of that wood.

3. Hoc opus nostræ salutis
Ordo depoposcerat,
Multiformis proditoris
Ars ut artem falleret,
Et medelam ferret inde,
Hostis unde læserat.

For the scheme of our Redemption
Had in justice planned it so,
That the wisdom of the serpent
Be by higher art brought low;
And the cure be found, and healing,
In the weapon of the foe!

4. Quando venit ergo sacri
Plenitudo temporis,
Missus est ab arce patris
Natus, orbis conditor,
Atque ventre virginali
Carne amictus prodiit.

When at last the blessèd fulness
Of the sacred time had come,
God the Son, the world's Creator,
Sent from forth the Father's home,
Came, a Son of man, amongst us,
Clothed with flesh in Virgin's womb.

5. Vagit infans inter arcta
Conditus præsepia,
Membra pannis involuta
Virgo Mater alligat,
Et Dei manus pedesque
Stricta cingit fascia.

Lying in a lowly manger,
List his tender infant cries!
See, in swaddling clothes, the Virgin
Wraps the Prince of Paradise!
Hands and feet and limbs, she binds
Him,
While all helplessly He lies.

6. Sempiterna sit beatæ
Trinitati gloria,
Æqua Patri Filioque,

To the Trinity be glory,
While the endless ages run:
To the Father, Son, and Spirit,

Par decus Paraclito,
Unius Trinique nomen
Laudet universitas. Amen.

Equal be the honor done:
And the Universe forever
Praise the mighty Three in One!
Amen.

LUSTRA SEX.

1. Lustra sex qui jam peregit
Tempus implens corporis,
Sponte libera Redemptor
Passioni deditus,
Agnus in Crucis levatur
Immolandus stipite.

Thirty years are ended; mortal
Space of life is nearly worn;
Willingly He goes to suffer
All the anguish and the scorn;
And the Lamb of immolation
Upward on the cross is borne!

2. Felle potus ecce languet;
Spina, clavi, lancea
Mite corpus perforarunt,

Unda manat et cruor;
Terra, pontus, astra, mundus
Quo lavantur flumine.

Drink of gall they give the Saviour
As He fainteth on the rood!
Thorns and nails and lance have pierced
Him;
Water floweth forth and blood!
Earth and sea and sky are bathed,
Oh, in what a precious flood!

3. Crux fidelis, inter omnes
Arbor una nobilis!
Silva talem nulla profert
Fronde, flore, germine.
Dulce ferrum, dulce lignum
Dulce pondus sustinent.

Faithful cross! of all the forest
Only one and noble Tree!
For in foliage, fruit, or flower
Woodland offers none like thee:
O sweet wood, and O sweet iron,
Sweetest weight is hung on ye!

4. Flecte ramos, arbor alta,
Tensa laxa viscera,
Et rigor lentescat ille,
Quem dedit nativitas,
Et superni membra Regis
Tende miti stipite.

Bend, O noble tree, thy branches:
Let thy fibres yielding be!
Let the rigid strength be softened
Which in birth was given thee,
That the limbs of my dear Jesus
May be stretched most tenderly!

5. Sola digna tu fuisti
Ferre mundi Victimam
Atque portum præparare
Arca mundo naufrago,
Quam sacer cruor perunxit
Fusus Agni corpore.

Worthy thou alone, the Victim
Offered for the world to bear:
As an ark, for shipwrecked creatures
Safest harbor to prepare:
With the sacred blood thou'rt sprinkled,
Which the Lamb shed hanging there.

6. Sempiterna sit beatæ
Trinitati gloria,
Æqua Patri Filioque,

To the Trinity be glory
While the endless ages run:
To the Father, Son, and Spirit,

Par decus Paraclito,
Unius Trinique nomen
Laudet Universitas. Amen.

Equal be the honor done:
And the Universe forever
Praise the mighty Three in One!
Amen.

NOTES.—VEXILLA REGIS.

The use of this hymn in the Divine Office for Passion-week, and in the *Reposition* of Good Friday, have made its stirring thought and melody a familiar strain to us.[1] The chant melody is full of sublime strength and feeling, and emphasizes the grand picture of the opening stanza with a martial swing which in the other verses can strangely tone itself down to a moan of supplication. Gounod has taken the plainest form of the chant-melody and made it the subject of his great "March to Calvary" in the *Redemption*—the chorus chanting the words with stately measure. It is not strange, then, that this hymn, wedded to a sublime melody, and filled with the memories of Passiontide, should be dear to Catholics. But, stripped of all melody and all associations, it still is a grand hymn. It has been translated by several Protestants, and finds a prominent place in their collections of Church hymns. Neale calls it "a world-famous hymn, one of the grandest in the treasury of the Latin Church;" Duffield, "surely one of the most stirring strains in our hymnology."

To understand the hymn aright, we must recall the occasion of its composition. St. Radegunda had "already enriched the church she had built with the relics of a great number of saints, but was very desirous to procure a particle of the true cross of our Redeemer, and sent certain clerks to Constantinople for that purpose. The emperor readily sent her a piece of that sacred wood, adorned with gold and precious stones; also a book of the four gospels,

[1] It is sung from Passion Sunday to Wednesday of Holy Week, at Vespers; in the procession on Holy Friday; also on the feast of the Invention of the Holy Cross. "Præterea, proprium est festivitatibus sanctæ crucis: denique cum illo quod sequitur (i. e., the Pange Lingua) plerumque in illis celebritatibus cantatur, quibus singulæ ecclesiæ memoriam Christi pro nobis crucifixi reverenter solent recolere.—Daniel, *Thes. Hymn.*, p. 161.

beautified in the same manner, and the relics of several saints. They were carried into Poitiers, and deposited in the church of the monastery by the archbishop of Tours in the most solemn manner, with a great procession, wax-tapers, incense, and the singing of psalms."[1] "Fortunatus festivam hanc pompam celebravit versibus. . . . tunc enim sanctus poëta ille composuit duos istos celebratissimos hymnos, quorum unus incipit: "Pange lingua gloriosi prœlium certaminis;" alter vero "Vexilla regis prodeunt;" qui ad celebranda sanctæ crucis præconia hactenus in Ecclesia usurpantur."[2] We see, then, a long procession wending its way to the church. All the pomp of ceremonial is there—banners fluttering in the air, rich vestments reflecting the rays of the sun, bishops, priests, and princes adding dignity to the occasion, while above all a gilded cross gleams high in the air—*fulget crucis mysterium.* That cross, and the near presence of a piece of the true cross, suggest readily the theme of the poet's song. It shall be a song of the Passion. The sacred symbol of our Redemption shall explain to us the theme and the contexts of the hymn.[3] The theme, then, is the cross. *Passio Domini venit,* says S. Ambrose, *et quia venit, debemus de ipsa aliquid dicere. Dicamus quod vexilla regis Christi prodeunt.*

Vexilla—according to some interpreters, baptism, the sacrament of the altar, and the other sacraments of the Church. Clichtoveus explains: "Vexilla sunt signa militaria principum et regum, quæ in bello eriguntur, ubi manus conseruntur cum hostibus. Haud aliter insignia sacra passionis Domini nostri, ut flagella, corona spinea, crux, clavi, lancea, sunt ejus vexilla, quibus antiquum debellavit hostem et principem hujus mundi ejecit foras. This latter Daniel considers better. Kayser very well dissents from both. Indeed, the *vexillum*

[1] Butler's *Lives of the Saints,* Aug. 13.

[2] *Acta Sanc. Aug.*, t. III., p. 59.

[3] "Dieses heilige Symbol giebt dem ganzen Gesange seine Richtung, seinen Inhalt, da dieses allein das fromme Gemueth des begeisterten Sængers beschæftigt." —Joh. Kayser, Beitræge zur Geschichte, etc., 2d Ed., p. 397.

is the standard of the cross. The old cavalry-standard of the Romans became under Constantine a Christian symbol. Now, it consisted of a square piece of cloth depending from a bar placed across the upper part of a gilt pole, surmounted no longer by the Roman eagle, but by the cross. The old Roman devices embroidered in the tapestry gave place, similarly, to Christian symbols.[1] Kayser has an elaborate criticism of this point, p. 397 seqq.

Mysterium—the mystic cross, symbolizing the mystery of our Redemption.

Unda et sanguine.—Says Daniel (who adopts the reading *unda sanguine*):

Unda ex mea sententia non de aqua est explicanda, e Servatoris latere profluente, sed nihil aliud voluit poeta nisi quod hymno sequenti (i. e., the *Pange lingua*) expressit: mite corpus perforatur, sanguis unda profluit. Vetusti interpretes cogitant de sacramentis baptismi et sacræ cœnæ, aqua et sanguine ex corde Christi manantibus præfiguratis. Nevertheless the poet had probably in mind the description found in John xix. 34, so that "et" is a better reading. So we have translated.

In nationibus—(Ps. xcv. 10) Dicite in gentibus quia Dominus regnavit *a ligno.* The Italic version had it: Tell it out unto the gentiles, that the Lord hath reigned from a Tree (Tertullian Adv. Marcion. l. iii., c. 19). Age nunc si legisti penes David: Dominus regnavit a ligno. Justin Martyr accuses the Jews of having corrupted the text (*Dialog. c. Tryphonem*, c. 63.

Purpura is, of course, the Most Precious Blood.

Statera.—"Dominus noster in statera crucis pretium nostræ salutis appendit. . . . plus dedit quam totus mundus valeret. (S. Aug., *serm.* 41 *de Pass. Dom*). So too S. Bernard: Crux facta est statera Corporis Christi, quod est ecclesia; cum

[1] "Quid enim est crux Domini aliud quam. . . . . vexillum cœlestis militiæ, arbor navis ecclesiæ, lignum vitæ in medio paradisi?"—Bellarmine, Concio xxix. in Dom. Pass.

enim ipse crucifigeretur, cum ipso appensa sunt peccata quæ committimus (*Hom. I. de vig. Paschæ*). March (*Lat. Hym.*, p. 254) has: *statera corporis*, the payment of the body having been made; others read *facta est;* many read *statera sæculi*, the price of the world." We have considered it as subject of *facta* (*est*), as an ablative absolute would require the *a* of statera to be long, whereas the metre forbids—only the odd feet in iambics allowing a long *thesis*.

The last two stanzas are not by Fortunatus. The Breviary leaves out two stanzas of the original hymn, and alters the position of a few verses. While there is no definite plan of rhyming adopted in the hymn, the frequent recurrence of assonances could not have been quite accidental.

PANGE, LINGUA, GLORIOSI PRŒLIUM CERTAMINIS.

The *Pange lingua*, and the *Lustra sex* make one complete hymn. It is commonly supposed to be the work of Fortunatus.[1] The magnificent swing of its rhythm needs on comment. Schaff calls it "the master-piece of Venantius Fortunatus. . . . and one of the finest hymns in the Latin language." Daniel thinks that no one at all acquainted with the genius of sacred poetry will deny it a place *in pulcherrimorum numero*[2] We may therefore agree with Schaff in saying that "Trench strangely omits the two best productions of this gifted poet." It was composed probably for the same occasion as the *Vexilla regis*. It is written in the favorite trochaic tetrameter catalectic, Fortunatus grouping three verses into a stanza.

The theme is the Passion of Christ.

Lauream,—in the original, *prœlium*. Neale does not admire

[1] Clichtoveus and G. Fabricius give it to Fortunatus, others to Mamertus Claudianus.

[2] Hymnum supra positum in pulcherrimorum numero cerensendum esse, id nemo infiitas ibit, nisi qui quæ sit vis et naturasacræ poeseos prorsus ignoraverit. Qua de re nunquam defuit carmini singularis quædam ecclesiæ cura atque auctoritas. Ponitur in Dominica et Hebdomade Passionis, tanquam dominicæ passionis et suavissimum præconium et devotissima adoratio. *Thes. Hymn.*, p. 166.

the change. "The recension of Urban VIII here entirely spoils the original,

Pange lingua gloriosi
Prœlium certaminis,

by substituting the word *Lauream.* It is not to the glory of the termination of Our Lord's conflict with the devil that the poet would have us look, but to the glory of the struggle itself, as indeed he tells us at the conclusion of the verse." The original at first sight seems to be tautological. But it is not so. *Certamen,* as distinguished from *prælium,* signifies not the battle itself, but rather the energy and striving of the soldiers. So Hirt. de B. Gal., "Fit prœlium acri certamine." *Prælium certaminis* would indicate the fierceness of the battle. *Certamen* was also a zealous competition for some prize; and so here the phrase would signify the struggle between Christ and Satan for the prize of the human race. Kayser considers the substitution of *lauream* "eine Ænderung, welche keineswegs eine glückliche zu nennen ist."

Trophæo.—The *trophæum'* trophy, was first a tree stripped of its boughs and adorned with various spoils of war. Perhaps the poet hinted at this, as well as the mere symbol of victory.

Notavit.—Mrs. Charles gives this version of the mediæval legend. "When Adam died, Seth obtained from the guardian cherubim of Paradise a branch of the tree from which Eve ate the forbidden fruit. This he planted on Golgotha, called the place of a skull, because Adam was buried there. From this tree, as the ages rolled on, were made the ark of testimony, the pole on which the brazen serpent was lifted up, and other instruments; and from its wood, at length, then growing old and hard, was made the cross."

Multiformis.—Satan appears to Eve as a serpent; in the temptation of Christ, as a man; to St. Antony, in many horrible shapes; nay, he can transform himself into "an angel of light," as the Apostle says (2 Cor. ii, 14). St. Augustine speaks of "milleformes dæmonum incursus."

Medelam ferret inde.—"Qui salutem humani generis in ligno crucis constituisti, ut unde mors oriebatur, inde vita resurgeret, et qui in ligno vincebat, in ligno quoque vinceretur" (Præf. de Cruce). And S. Bernard: "Victoria de diabolo etsi alio modo potuit, tamen alio modo impleri non debuit. . . . Necessarium fuit, eum per hominem vinci et per lignum, qui hominem vicerat per lignum, ut unde mors oriebatur, inde vita resurgeret," etc. (*De Pass. Dom.*, c. 46).

Plenitudo temporis.—"Ubi venit plenitudo temporis misit Deus filium suum factum ex muliere," etc. (Gal. iv. 4).

Conditus.—*Orbis conditor* is now *conditus*—"the poet plays with the sound and sense, like Shakespeare."

Fascia,—the subject of *cingit*.

Lustra.—The "lustration" or purification of the Roman people in the Campus Martius took place every five years. Hence *lustrum* came to mean the period between the lustrations.

Potus,—pass. part. perf.

Crux fidelis.—Schaff thinks this stanza "a gem of rare beauty."

Viscera, fibres.

Arca.—"Mare transeundum est, et lignum contemnis? . . . . quia lignum humilitatis ejus tibi necessarium erat; superbia enim tumueras et longe ab illa patria rejectus eras, et fluctibus hujus sæculi interrupta est via, et qua transeatur ad patriam non est, nisi ligno porteris" (*In Evang.*, John ii. 4).

H. T. HENRY.

GREEK CATHOLICS AND LATIN PRIESTS.

WITHIN recent years immigration from the Austro-Hungarian Empire has brought into the United States large numbers of people belonging to the different Slavonic nationalities. The great majority of these are Catholics, that is to say, they acknowledge the Sovereign Pontiff

of Rome as the supreme head of their Church. As the Slavonic countries occupy what might be called the border-line between the Eastern and Western Church, the Catholics who come from these districts belong to various rites. It is well known that the Church consists of two great divisions, the Latin and the Greek, which, like two arms belonging to the same body, labor in unity for the maintenance of the apostolic doctrine, and, whilst they give scope to the characteristic activity of the Oriental and Western nationalities, are directed in their labors for the preservation of Christianity undefiled by one and the same head, the successor of St. Peter at Rome. Besides the Greek Catholics who are in communion with the Holy See, there are others who live under separate patriarchs more or less subject either to the Czar or to the Turkish government. These are distinguished as Greek schismatics, whilst the Catholics are called "united Greeks." Although we have properly no concern with the former, as they are not subject to the Holy See, there is at present a decided movement, favored by powerful elements on both sides, to bring back the Greek schismatics to Catholic union.

As to the orthodox Greeks who have settled in the United States, various questions have been raised in reference to the attitude which the Latin clergy are to hold towards them, since in the absence of a regularly constituted hierarchy and sufficient number of priests belonging to the Greek rite, many of these Catholic immigrants are left without the proper ministrations of their religion.

Nor can this evil, which apparently exposes thousands of the Slavonic people to the loss of their faith in this country, be summarily remedied. As to our own clergy, the situation is entirely a new and unusual one. For, although the Greek Catholics profess the same faith with ourselves, their hierarchical constitution, ecclesiastical discipline, ritual, and liturgical service differ both in form and language from our own. There has never been any occasion or necessity for the spe-

cial study of the Eastern Church and the rites by which it administers the sacraments to the faithful, and the student of theology has had no opportunity to familiarize himself with the usages of the Greeks. On the other hand, these Catholics are not accustomed to our ritual, and with the natural reverence for tradition which goes with the Eastern character, they can only with difficulty be persuaded to adopt any other rite than their own. Besides, they can hardly be said to have chosen permanent domicile in any particular spot in the United States. They frequently move from one place to another, according as they find work, especially along the railroads and in the mining districts.

The Holy See has not only at all times respected the diversity of discipline and rite in the Greek Church, but in many instances has legislated for its preservation, inasmuch as it expresses the spirit of respect for lawful tradition without interference in doctrine. These facts have prompted us to attempt a general survey of the present status in the Church, of these Catholic immigrants, so as to throw some light on the relative position which we hold towards them in this country.

It is difficult at the present time to obtain anything like reliable and complete statistics as to the Catholic Slav element professing the Greek rite in the United States. Those immigrants who have settled chiefly in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the Western States, particularly Minnesota, are for the most part Ruthenians, and only a comparatively small portion speak the Hungarian dialect. Separate congregations have been formed, with resident priests from the Ruthenian dioceses of Eperies, Muncacs, and also from the archdiocese of Lemberg. These priests are under the jurisdiction of their respective bishops in Europe, but they hold commendatory letters from the Propaganda at Rome, which insure them liberty of action and the exercise of jurisdiction within their own sphere, and a certain protection on the part of our bishops. Churches

exclusively for the use of Greek Catholics have been erected in a few places.[1] In some instances they worship in our ordinary parish churches according to their own rite whenever they can obtain the services of a Greek priest. They understand for the most part that the obligation of hearing Mass and receiving the sacraments can be equally satisfied in the Latin churches, although they naturally prefer to have the ministrations of religion in their own way, especially as they meet with not a little prejudice from our people, who have not been accustomed to the difference of rites in the Eastern and Western Churches. Where there are not a sufficiently large number of Greek Catholics to form distinct congregations of their own rite, such as we have at Shenandoah (Archdioc. Philadelphia); Shamokin (Dioc. Harrisburg); Kingston, Freeland, Olyphant, Wilkesbarre, and Hazelton (Dioc. Scranton); Jersey City and Passaic (Dioc. Newark); Minneapolis (Archdioc. St. Paul) etc.,—they sometimes combine with the Hungarian Catholics of the Latin rite in building a church, with the understanding that a priest of their own rite be allowed to officiate therein from time to time. No doubt it will not be long before the Holy See appoints a regular bishop for these Catholics in the United States, so as to have priests of their own rite ordained here who are familiar with the manners and methods of the new world, thus facilitating the amalgamation of the races without prejudice to their sacred rights and privileges.

[1] A careful inquiry into the actual status of the Greek Church in the United States, at the present time gives us the following data:

There are about 150,000 Catholics professing the Greek rite in the United States. These have nine priests of their own rite administering to their spiritual necessities, and who are properly accredited by the Holy See and their respective bishops in Europe, viz. Rev. Theofan Obuszkiewicz (Galicia) at Shamokin, Shenandoah, and Mahonoy City, Pa.—Rev. Alexius Toth (Hungary) at Minneapolis, Min.—Rev. Joannes Zapotocky (Hungary) at Kingston, Pa.—Rev. Gregorius Hruszka (Galicia) at Jersey City, N. J.—Rev. Alexander Dzubay (Hungary) at Wilkesbarre, Pa.—Rev. Eugene Volkay (Hungary) at Hazleton, Pa.—Rev. Gabriel Vislocky (Hun-

Any one who comes in closer contact with these Catholics, who generally pass under the name of Hungarians, will be struck by the fact that there is a considerable difference, even among themselves, as to language, customs, and religious observances. Among the Hungarians who come to this country there are Greek Catholics of the Ruthenian, of the Roumanian, of the Slovenic, and of the Armenian rites. To understand this difference among people of apparently the same race, we must advert to their position in the country from which they come. In Hungary proper there are eleven ecclesiastical provinces of the Latin rite, two ecclesiastical provinces of the Greek rite, together with several dioceses not included in the jurisdiction of the latter, and an archbishopric with exclusive jurisdiction over Catholics of the Armenian rite.

The different dioceses of the (United) Greek Church represent several distinct rites using their own language and liturgy, although in matters of doctrine they are all in harmony with the Roman Church, whose head is, as we said before, their own. Thus in Galicia and Upper Hungary the Greek Catholics follow what is called the Ruthenian rite, using the Ruthenian language in the liturgy.[2] The inhabi-

gary) at Olyphant, Pa.—Rev. Cyrillus Gulovich (Hungary) at Freeland, Pa.—Rev. Stephan Jackovich at Nikisport, Pa.

On the 29th of last October eight of the above-named priests of the Greek Church met in conference at Wilkesbarre, Pa. for the purpose of petitioning the Holy See through their respective bishops to appoint a Vicar General with authority over all the Catholics of Greek rite in the United States. In all probability this step will soon be taken and thus some of the difficulties which arise out of doubtful jurisdiction in certain cases will be removed.

[2] The Ruthenians (Russniacs) appear to have originally come from Russia, although their present language and even character show a marked difference between them and the Muscovites. They settled in Panonia prior to the arrival there of the Magyars, and it is said that they professed the Catholic faith at the time of SS. Cyril and Methodius. As the first missionaries to Hungary came from the East, the Greek rite was universally adopted throughout Hungary. Such we find it at the time of St. Stephan I., at the end of the tenth century. Large bodies of Ruthenians immigrated on subsequent occasions, notably under the reign of Louis the Great (1342

tants of Transylvania who profess the Greek rite use the Roumanian language [1] in the public service, whilst the Greek Croats employ the ancient Slovenic language. The so-called Armenian Catholics have likewise their own ritual and language. Those who inhabit Galicia and the duchy of Bukowina are under the separate jurisdiction of the Armenian archbishop, but the many scattered Greek Catholics throughout Hungary and Transylvania belong to the jurisdiction of the local Latin bishops. Among the Armenian Catholics we must distinguish the Mechitarists. [2] They are, generally speaking, subject to the Latin bishops, although there is a resident archbishop of this rite at Vienna, who exercises jurisdiction over Galicia.

Where the Greek Catholics are under the jurisdiction of Latin bishops they nevertheless retain the privileges attached to their own Church. In Vienna the church of St. Barbara belongs to the Greeks; and both the Ruthenians and Roumanians worship in it. The Armenian Catholics likewise have their own churches in Vienna, Trieste, Venice. Altogether the proportion of Catholics professing the Greek rite to those belonging to the Latin Church is, for Austria, about one to seven; for Hungary, about one to five. [3]

–1382). Gradually the Latin rite prevailed in Hungary, under the influence of Latin civilization and political predominance.

[1] The Roumanian Catholics (Moldo-Wallachians) obtained a separate hierarchy under St. Stephan, in the tenth century, who erected the diocese of Alba Julia (Karlsburg). Subsequently the Latin archbishop of Kolocza exercised jurisdiction over it as Metropolitan. The Empress Maria Theresa procured the erection of another diocese for the Roumanians (Gross-Wardein) as part of the Metropolitan See of Gran. In 1854, Pius IX established the separate province of Fogara, which, united with the diocese of Alba Julia, constitutes the Metropolitan See, embracing under its jurisdiction the bishoprics Lugos, Gross-Wardein (Nagy-Várad) and Szamos-Ujvar. The archbishop resides at Blasendorf.

[2] Named after the founder of a religious community according to the rule of St. Benedict.

[3] Details under this head may be found in the excellent work of Fr. *Nicolaus Nilles, S. J., Symbolæ ad illustrandam historiam Ecclesiæ occidentalis in terris coronæ Sti. Stephani. Oeniponte,* 1885. Complementary works on the subject are the historical atlasses by the same author, published by B. Herder.

It is a matter of some practical importance to know how far a priest of the Latin rite may use his canonical faculties in regard to those Catholics who are not properly under the jurisdiction of our bishops. The disciplinary laws of the Church provide that a priest may not baptize or marry or administer the last sacraments outside of his own parish, unless in cases of absolute necessity. In the same way the faculties of bishops are restricted under ordinary circumstances. All this is intended to preserve good order and favor an equitable administration in matters of external religion. In the case of Greek Catholics it is frequently impossible for them to apply to their own priests at a distance, much less to their bishops in Europe, for the requisite faculties in order to obtain the ministrations of their religion. Under such circumstances a certain amount of discretionary power seems to be demanded as imperative. How far missionary priests are to exercise jurisdiction in these cases must be determined by the ordinaries of the different dioceses in whose territory Catholics of the Greek rite may be found. The Propaganda ordinarily sends private instructions in such cases to individual bishops. This is done in order to test the basis upon which a general legislation to suit anomalous and novel circumstances may subsequently be formed. The faculties, therefore, accorded to bishops of the Latin rite in Austria, and by which they exercise jurisdiction over the clergy and people of the Oriental Church, cannot be presumed to be applicable in the United States, unless where the Holy See has intimated it expressly; the more so, as our bishops have not any direct jurisdiction whatever over these Catholics. If such jurisdiction be eventually given, with a view of bringing the two Churches into a closer union, it would probably be upon the lines marked out for the Greek Catholics in Italy who live under the jurisdiction of the Latin bishops, rather than upon any model established in the Austro-Hungarian provinces. The fact that the Slavonic element must in progress of time lose

much of its characteristic form and become Americanized will also tend to eliminate the distinctive religious features in them, and whilst the Eastern habits and traditions make a perpetuation of this national side of religion a necessity and probably an advantage not easily compensated for at home, it is by no means so in this country, where the conditions of society and government make a harmonious activity on the part of all citizens the only real guarantee of national peace and prosperity.

Benedict XIV in his Constitution *Etsi pastoralis* has drawn up a number of regulations which set forth the relative duties of the Greek and Latin clergy in regard to each other and towards Catholics not of their own rite living in the Italian Peninsula or the adjacent islands.

According to these rules each his to administer the Sacraments only in his own rite, and not to adopt any part of the ceremonial of the other. In all cases the Latin rite is, however, looked upon as becoming the normal condition, and, other things being equal, enjoys, as we should expect, the preference over the Greek rite. Thus, if Greeks wish to have their children baptized according to the Latin rite, they are free to do so; but the Latin Catholic cannot lawfully have his children baptized according to the Greek rite. If the father belongs to the Latin rite and the mother to the Greek, the child is to be baptized according to the Latin rite; but if the father be a Greek and the mother a Roman Catholic, the child is to be baptized in the Greek rite, although it may, if the father so allows it, be baptized in the Latin Church. The children belong invariably to the parish of the church in whose rite they have been baptized. However, the children of Greek Catholics who have received baptism according to the Latin rite through necessity, i. e., because they were in danger of death or because there was no priest of the Greek rite to administer it—are to be still considered subjects of the Greek Church, unless they elect otherwise after having obtained the use of reason. Greek

Catholics who have once voluntarily adopted the Latin rite, or have been baptized in the same, unless in case of the aforesaid necessity, cannot return to the Greek rite. The reason is plain: "Ritus enim latinus propter suam præstantiam, eo quod sit ritus sanctæ Rom. Ecclesiæ, omnium ecclesiarum matris et magistræ, sic supra Græcum ritum prævalet. . . . ut non modo ab ipso ad Græcum transitus nullatenus permittatur, verum etiam a Græcis semel assumptus absque apostolica dispensatione deseri nequeat."[1] In cases where a Greek wishes to join the Latin rite, the consent of the Latin bishop is required.

In regard to the Sacrament of Confirmation, which is usually given in the Greek Church conjointly with Baptism, the Greek clergy in Italy are forbidden from conforming to this practice. Hence Catholics baptized according to the Greek rite in Italy can be confirmed by the Latin bishop in the absence of a Greek bishop. Priests of the Greek rite can receive the holy chrism from the Latin bishop; the other sacred oils are to be consecrated according to their own rite.[2]

If in case of necessity a Greek priest absolves a Latin Catholic, he is to use the form of absolution prescribed by the Council of Florence for that purpose.

A Latin priest is not permitted to say Mass at an altar especially consecrated for the Greek rite; but if through necessity a church has to accommodate both Greek and Latin Catholics, a separate altar is to be erected for the use of the Latin priest. Each celebrant is obliged to adhere to his own rite, nor can a Latin priest distribute holy Communion in fermented bread, or the Greek in unfermented bread, but the sacred particles of each are to be guarded in a separate Tabernacle, only to be opened by the priest of the re-

[1] Doc. cit., § 2, xiii.

[2] The Baptismal water blessed with the respective ceremonies of each Church cannot be used by a priest administering the sacrament in another rite than the one for which it has been blessed.

spective rite to which the altar is dedicated. A Roman Catholic cannot receive holy Communion from a Greek priest; but a Greek Catholic, if there be no church of his own rite, can receive holy Communion from the Latin priest. In some places, however, where the contrary custom has actually obtained, of Latin and Greek Catholics receiving the H. Eucharist under either form, the Holy See has tolerated it, but with the injunction of gradually abolishing the practice, which fosters confusion and laxity of discipline.[1] The Greek clergy may celebrate upon altar stones consecrated by the Latin bishop, but a Latin priest may not celebrate upon the *antimensia* of the Greeks.

A cleric who has received subdeaconship or deaconship in the Greek Church, if he be subsequently promoted to the priesthood in the Latin Church, has first to receive the order of exorcist, which is not given in the Greek Church. The minor orders of acolythus and ostiarius need not be supplied, as they are supposed to be conferred in the order of subdeaconship as given in the Greek Church. A Latin bishop cannot ordain subjects of the Greek rite nor make use of their ceremonial.

The marriage ceremony is to be celebrated in the Latin church and according to the Latin rite, if the husband be a Roman Catholic, though the wife be a Greek. If the husband belong to the Greek Church, and the wife to the Latin, the ceremony is to be performed according to the Greek rite and by a Greek priest, unless the husband desire to have it done in the Latin rite. The Roman Catholic may not adopt the Greek rite of his wife, but the latter may follow the religious practice of her Latin husband. If she does so, she cannot return to the Greek Church after his death. The preference of the Roman rite is accordingly everywhere emphasized as being that of the mother Church and the supreme teacher, who, whilst she respects the traditions and indulges the national peculiarities of her children,

[1] Cf. Docum. cit., § 6, xiv.

nevertheless aims constantly to draw closer the bond of unity in doctrine and discipline among them, so that, as there is one shepherd, there may be but one fold even in the outward form, as in the spirit which unites these many nations of East and West.

In concluding what we feel to be a very incomplete account of the subject, we would call attention to the fact that there are among the immigrants who profess the Greek Catholic faith some who belong to the schismatic body. These do not acknowledge the Holy See as supreme head of the Church, although they have validly ordained priests, who, if received into the orthodox Church, may be canonically authorized to exercise the functions of the Catholic priesthood. Outside of this their claims must be a matter of caution to our bishops and clergy.

THE EDITOR.

MORAL THEOLOGY AND CIVIL LAW.

(*A Review.*)

Le Code civil commenté a l'usage du clergé dans ses rapports avec la Théologie morale, le Droit canon et l'Economie politique. Par M. le Chanoine Allégre, Docteur en Theologie et en Droit canon.—Paris. Delhomme, 1888. *Vol.* I (x *et* 752 *App.* i—iv *pp.* 94.) *et vol.* II (*pp.* 1050).

THE importance of the study of civil law as a branch of the ecclesiastical disciplines cannot easily be overrated, particularly in our own day and country. The laws of the State, unless they are manifestly unjust, bind in conscience according to the gravity of the duties which they enjoin.[1] As they are bound up with, and to a large extent regulate, the moral relations of citizens towards each other, as for example in marriage contracts, testamentary dispositions, adjustment of property rights and the various other claims of

[1] Bouquillon: Theol. Moral. fundament. Ed. II, n. 209 seq

contracting parties, it becomes the positive duty of the acknowledged moderator and guide of consciences to familiarize himself with the laws of the land in which he lives and performs his priestly functions.

The position of confessor alone frequently places the most important affairs of his penitents in the keeping of a priest. An error in judgment resting upon ignorance of facts dependent on the civil law, may make him even involuntarily the abetter of injustice and serious losses of which he alone bears the responsibility. To have disappointed the confidence of people who trusted no less to our knowledge than to our sincerity, is often equivalent to estranging them from the religion whose minister had become to them a source of distrust. Apart from the tribunal of penance and the direction of souls, the social position of the priest among his own people, who look upon him as a father and judge will frequently oblige him to act as arbiter in common or private disputes. But the mission of peace-maker must rest its judgments not only on a sense of equity, but also on the actual provisions of law, and in settling a difficulty upon the principle of what seems fair, a priest may be confronted with the charge of having arrogated to himself rights which belong to the State and are defined by civil legislation.

The study of Civil Law has always been recognized as an essential complement of the study of Canon Law. Where the canonical norms were deficient the church always made use of the Roman Law not only in ecclesiastical trials but for the formulating of statutes and prescriptions in Diocesan Synods. To this day we meet constantly not only with the terminology of, but with citations from, the *Institutiones*, the *Pandectæ* and the *Codex*.

Canonists distinguished these laws under the name of *leges approbatæ* (canonizatæ), *reprobatæ*, and *neque approbatæ neque reprobatæ;* these last however, as being *a jure canonico tacite approbatæ*, are of value ; so that the ecclesiastical judge having no definitely ecclesiastical laws to abide by must pass sen-

tence according to these laws. St. Alphonsus mentions this briefly (Moral, lib I. n. 106); for having just previously (in no. 104) spoken of the obligations of the Civil Law in general, after referring to the Decrees of the Cardinal-Congregations, the Decisions of the Rota, and the Regulæ Cancellariæ, it is evident that the holy doctor refers here to the Civil Law in the sense indicated above.[1] Benedict XIV treats this subject at length in his great work De Synodo diocesana.[2] Towards the close of the last century the Roman Law, as is well known, was in many States supplanted by a code of civil statutes deviating in many respects from the old norm. Accordingly the question arose whether and how far such laws, not rejected by the Church as an equitable norm of state government could be adopted in place of the *Jus Romanum*, for ecclesiastical trials? Bouquillon (n. 102, p. 263–264), gives the answer to the question, and we have what is called two probable opinions, the affirmative of which would seem to be the stronger. Be this as it may, certain it is that these modern State laws, *posistis ponendis*, bind in conscience like the Roman Law, and that, therefore, those, who follow the decisions of the older Theologians in certain cases where the modern laws depart from the Roman Law, act very unreasonably, inasmuch as the older Theologians were obliged to appeal to the *Jus Romanum*, and its commentators, having no other code. Thus for example according to the *Jus Romanum* it was doubtful whether a contract, a testament, a legacy, to which only the formalities prescribed by law were wanting, was, before the judicial sentence, valid or not, according to the *jus naturale*. Of the various opinions of Theologians on this question (Lehmkuhl, I, n. 1071–1074; 1147–1148) St. Alphonsus selects only those two which appear of most weight in the matter, and framing a third opinion on the reasons of these two, decides according to the *principium possessionis* (St. Alph.

[1] Bouquillon, l. c., n. 210, p. 418.

[2] L. cap. 10–14.

III. [al. IV.] n. 711 et 927. Allègre Vol. II, p. 213 et seqq). But in more recent legislation, especially in the French, such a contract, when it concerns only the rights of private individuals,—a testament or legacy, of this kind is according to the unanimous opinion of Jurists *most certainly valid*, even in the case where the nullity of such a legacy, etc., is expressed in the statutes. With these decisions of the Jurists before us, it is clear that the case must be decided in accordance with their judgment.[1] From what we have said, it must be quite evident that the confessor who rests his decisions in matters of conscience and exclusively upon the opinions of the older Theologians and Casuists, may fall into error. Modern legislation whilst it cannot change the underlying principles of justice or equity, nevertheless may modify their application in various ways.

It is therefore with genuine pleasure that we call attention to a work which performs this task of adjusting the Moral and the Civil law under varying circumstances with a singular thoroughness supported by solid reasoning and erudition. Canon Allègre's book, the title of which heads this article, presents two goodly volumes covering about two thousand pages. The author has primarily in view the French legislation of to-day. But those who are familiar with the constitution of the present French republic will concede that it admits a very close comparison with the American law. And as Canon Allègre has pointed out both the advantages and the defects of the French code as viewed from the Catholic and moral point, the study of his work is calculated to do good and timely service among ourselves.

In 1843 Cardinal Gousset, then Vicar-general of Langres, published a work under the same title as the above. It was much smaller in compass, and has reached an eleventh edition. But within the last fifty years many and great changes have

[1] See Lehmkuhl, l. c. and especially *Marres* De Justitia lib. I, n. 365–375, III, n. 22–37, Bouquillon, n. 225.

occurred in French legislation so that a new treatment of this same subject became a necessity. Canon Allègre has certainly brought to the performance of his task not only careful and conscientious toil, but, as we said above, deep and thorough learning. Nothing seems to have been passed over which could throw light both on the bright and the dark sides of French legislation, so as to enable the priest under all circumstances to fulfil his office without violence to his conscience and with justice towards the souls entrusted to his care. It is well known that the French code, especially the Code Napoléon has been held in high esteem by men such as Pius IX of holy memory, whose testimony the author cites among others.[1] But if the French code has its excellent points, it has also its striking defects, especially as it exists in its present form, and defects of such a nature as prevail in almost all recent state legislation. In laying open the weak points of the French law the learned writer calls the attention of the legislators to the just claims of Catholics; and, in order to give to his argument a more practical turn, he makes a careful study of the leading French political parties in the light of national economy.

The *plan* pursued by the author throughout the work may be outlined thus: First he prefaces each title by a rapid sketch of the historical development of the subject-matter treated therein, from the Roman and older Gallic law down to the latest form of the latter, at the same time pointing out the principles of the *jus naturale* which underlie both. Next he gives a short exposition of each article; and finally to make clear the application of the particular laws, he subjoins in their proper places, cases and practical suggestions.

The author devotes much consideration to the laws respecting matrimonial contracts.[2] The dogmatical side of Mat-

[1] Cfr. Vol II, p. 1040.

[2] They are treated in Vol. I., pp. 121–336; then again at pp. 657–751, and in the Appendix annexed to this Vol. I., pp. 1–75 and pp. 88–94; and lastly what relates to the disposition of personal property of the married pair in Vol. II., pp. 459–580—making altogether about 462 pages.

rimony is also carefully dealt with, while in what belongs to Canon Law the *Impedimentorum Matrimonii Synopsis*,—a tract which has already been separately reviewed in the American Eccles. Review,[1] and recommended by P. Bucceroni in his Enchiridion[2] is embodied in the present work which follows, however, the third edition.

The burning question *de divortio* which agitates political and religious society in France, as elsewhere, is discussed in detail, and the debates in the French Chambers on this head, in which Bishop Freppel took so distinguished a part, as well as the masterly conference of the celebrated P. Felix on the same subject, are given in full at the end of the first volume. From the many single points touching this matter, all of which deserve careful study, we select only one, namely, the question whether the *secular* power can place *impediments* to matrimony, that would invalidate the marriage of unbaptized persons, such as Jews, or Pagans. In recent years distinguished canonists and theologians have answered this question absolutely in the negative.[3] In former times however the contrary was the more common opinion. To this latter opinion Canon Allègre subscribes,[4] and he supports it by reference to Cavagnis[5] who has written solidly on this point, and cites a decision of the S. Cong. de Prop. Fide, given June 26th, 1820 in favor of this opinion. The theologians of this Congregation had expressed a similar opinion on Oct. 8th 1631, as may be seen in the *Collectanea Missionum* n. 921. But the most solid argument for this opinion, namely, that the State has the power to institute such impediments, is adduced by Resemans.[6] With us a question such as this might become a practical one, if for example, in the State of Virginia, where according to Kent[7] this impediment exists,

[1] 1890, May, p. 394.
[2] Page 190.
[3] Cfr. Feije de Imp. Matr., n. 67 seq.
[4] Vol. I., p. 126 ad 9.
[5] Institutiones juris publici ecclesiastici, Romæ 1883 Vol. III., n. 176 et seq.
[6] De competentiâ civili in vinculum conjugale infidelium.—Romæ 1887.
[7] Commentaries, Vol. II., Part IV., p. 49, n. 85, note (a).

we should have a case if an unbaptized man, having contracted matrimony with the sister (also unbaptized) of his deceased wife, wished to become a Catholic.

There is considerable learning shown in the discussions and remarks, particularly relating to the acquisition of property, to testaments, the right to testate according to the *jus naturale*, etc.[1] In the question so much argued among theologians concerning the obligation arising out of contracts *de re turpi* the author decides according to Marc. n. 1036, and St. Alph. III, (al. IV,) n. 712. notwithstanding that the French Statutes (Art. 1131), deny all effects to such a contract. Worthy of particular notice also is the opinion of the author on the question; *An si quis velit incendere domum Titii inimici, et incendat (ex errore) domum Caji amici teneatur Cajo restituere damnum?* St. Alph. III, (al IV,) n. 629. As is well known there are two opinions on this question. St. Alphonsus regards the negative as probable, and gives a full statement of the reasons for this opinion. Lehmkuhl inclines more to the affirmative side, (I, n. 977.). Canon Allègre goes still further and maintains that in practice, this opinion namely the affirmative, is the only one to be followed ("seule à suivre en pratique"). This we think is claiming too much. For granting that it is advisable to follow the affirmative opinion in practice, there are nevertheless found confessors, who in certain circumstances consider the negative more beneficial to their penitents, and moved by the reasons of St. Alphonsus which are certainly not without weight would decide accordingly.[2]

With money loans and interests *ex titulo legis*, the author deals comprehensively and thoroughly.[3] Starting from the fundamental principles of St. Thomas and Benedict XIV, as explained by the latter in his Constitution "Vix pervenit"[4]

[1] Vol. II., p. 130 et seq.

[2] It is an error to say that St. Alph. calls the affirmative, the "sententia communis Theologorum."

[3] Quoted in extenso at p. 1031.

[4] Vol. II., pp. 719–734; pp. 1001–1036.

and guided by the most solid authors and various ecclesiastical decisions, he shows the gradual development of the present practice of the Church, and her wise attitude in regard to the customs of *mutuum* in ancient and modern times. He also enters into some interesting details regarding the methods used in banking. As to ecclesiastics participating in these matters, Canon Allègre follows the milder practice, but with this very just restriction, that the ecclesiastic, in purchasing *actions i. e.* shares (not bonds) of a commercial and industrial character, may make a safe and fruitful investment of his money, but cannot invest it in speculations which are without definite security; which is to say, that he should be morally certain of the safety not only of his capital but also of the percentage. For this opinion the author quotes Icard, le Canoniste contemporain, and Vecchiotti. He could also have quoted Aertnys [1] in as far as this theologian declares the milder opinion *non improbabilis*, while he holds the more rigorous opinion, which considers all participation in these matters on the part of ecclesiastics, when carried on by means of shares, as illicit, as *probabilior*. Bishop Aichner writing on this point [2] appeals to the "Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie," [3] and puts the question thus: "Quæritur: num venditio et retentio actionum industrialium et commercialium (sacerdotibus) licita sit? Respondeo licitam esse, quatenus agitur tantum de necessaria sortis elocatione, sed illicitam si fit potissimum quæstûs et lucri causa."

Throughout Canon Allègre's work we have to admire the solidly Catholic tone of his sentiments, the soundness of his theological teaching, and the lucidity of his expositions, which may be said to be a characteristic of French writers of this class. [4]

JOS. PUTZER, C. SS. R.

[1] Ed. I., Lib. v. n. 70. qu. 2. [2] Comp. jur. eccles., ed. 6. p. 245.

[3] Innsbruck 1877, p. 453.

[4] Passing over several slight inaccuracies (e. g., Rossius for Bossius. Vol. I., p. 669, Bengen for Bangen, ib. p. 707.) we would remark *en passant* that the American

LESSONS OF THE FR. MATHEW CENTENARY.[1]

THE centenary of Father Mathew has come and gone. Both here and in America, and wherever the English tongue resounds, men have been made familiar with the life and labors and glorious triumphs of our great countryman. From the pulpit and the platform the beautiful story of his life has been told; and our modern current literature, in all the various shapes which it assumes, has done its duty.

In thus honoring one whose virtue was conspicuous, whose life was spent in conferring upon his fellow men benefits that were immense and indisputable, we have but honored ourselves. The real significance of the late celebration lies rather in the fact that it gave a new impulse to the work of Father Mathew. It is for us to show in the present and in the future—and let us hope that it shall be shown—that the celebration was not unworthy of the man or of the cause—no transient ebullition or idle pageant. There ought to be, and there assuredly shall be, something more practical and more abiding to mark the centenary of the great reformer. The "reviving of his spirit and giving a new fillip to the work of his life," that must be the work and fruit of Father Mathew's centenary. The action of the bishops and priests of Ireland, —and their example has been followed largely outside of Ireland,—will be at once its fittest celebration and its most abiding fruit. The key-note of that action was struck, early in the year, by the Archbishop of Dublin. In reply to a letter of invitation to a meeting in the Mission-House over

Council cited in Vol. I., p. 147, was not held, as the author believes, in 1867, but in 1866, being no other than the Second Plen. Conc. of Baltimore, and that the proposal to abolish the Caput *Tametsi* (ib. p. CXLV. n. XVII.) is to be understood in the sense of n. 340.

[1] A paper on the subject of Father Mathew comes with special appropriateness from the home of the Apostle of Temperance, and will, no doubt, be welcome to most of our readers who are interested in the promotion of the total abstinence cause. —Edit.

which the Lord Mayor presided, his Grace wrote to say that it seemed to him a mockery to erect statues and halls to the memory of Father Mathew, unless they were prepared, at the same time, to learn the great lessons of his life; and that, till some movement was organized to take up his work, he could take no part in what seemed an empty ceremony.

It is not too late, then, nay it is just the time to look back and ask what advantages the great festival has brought us, and what lessons it has taught.

In the first place, that event at least demonstrated that the memory of Father Mathew is sustained in the hearts of his countrymen, and of millions besides; that his services can never be forgotten, and that his name is destined to take a high place among the greatest of Irishmen, and among the best benefactors of the human race. Wherever great and unselfish efforts in the cause of virtue and of mankind are appreciated, there the centenary of the great Temperance Apostle brought joy.

One could not help feeling, too, that Father Mathew's work is not wholly dead. The lessons he taught are not quite forgotten; and the seed he cast must bear fruit forever. It is the beautiful thought of Cardinal Manning that much or all of the temperance movement of our time is grafted on the trunk of the tree which Father Mathew's hand planted. We know that we have fallen off from our first fervor, that we have forgotten much, and that many will cavil with the words which we here write. But there is a public opinion to-day very different from that against which Father Mathew had to labor. Total abstinence principles have at least toleration everywhere, and total abstinence is no longer an indication of oddity. The clergy of all denominations are more favorable; the medical faculty may be said to have come over to our side; large and well organized temperance societies abound; there are powerful organizations laboring for the total abolition of drink traffic in our midst, and a resolution in favor of the principle of Local Option has been

passed in the English House of Commons on three several occasions, and with ever-increasing majorities. But let us fix our attention for a moment on this public opinion, the existence of which we can certify, and the importance of which we cannot over-rate. The 100,000 people that took part in the late demonstration at Cork were not all or nearly all total abstainers, but they all came there to honor the memory of the greatest preacher of total abstinence, and to honor, at the same time, the men who walked in procession with badges on their breasts, which indicated that they held to the teachings of Father Mathew.

Let us take another instance. In the ancient town of Roscrea we have a branch of the League of the Cross, with a membership of nearly a thousand. On last St. Patrick's Day we determined to have a temperance demonstration in honor of Father Mathew. About five hundred men and boys marched through the town with band and banners. A great crowd came from neighboring parishes to witness the procession; the on-lookers must have been about 10,000 persons. Now, none of these latter were total abstainers, and St. Patrick's Day in the past time used to be the drinking day above all others in the year; and yet we have the assurance of one who carefully noted the facts, for saying, that on that occasion not a single drunken man was to be seen. Why? Because it was a *temperance day*, and because public opinion demanded that at least moderation should be observed by all.

It is, nevertheless, also apparent that much of Father Mathew's work has been undone, and that his teaching has been, to a large extent, forgotten. Let us take a few facts and figures. We live in a country of periodic famines, and yet we spend in drink eleven millions a year! The Drink Bill of last year for those countries amounted to 132 millions, a considerable increase on those of the years immediately preceding. And Mr. Goschen, in his Budget Speech (April, '90), after speaking of this "rush to alcohol" as one of the

first indications of returning prosperity, used the following words: "I call the special attention of the House of Commons to this extraordinary circumstance, a circumstance that will be deplored by almost all for many reasons, and which places on the Government and on the House an increasing liability to deal with the question of alcoholic drinks. . . . It is an extraordinary historical fact, that in the year '75–'76, which was the greatest drinking year on record, there was precisely the same rush, in precisely the same proportion of those different classes of spirits." Testimonies of another kind might be here adduced to show how far the countrymen of Father Mathew, at home and abroad, had forgotten his teachings; those solemn words, for instance, spoken by the bishops of Ireland from the Maynooth Synod. But such testimonies must be familiar to us all; and we conclude this point with the astounding figures which Mr. White gives as the sum total of the annual cost of our drinking customs—£310,000,000.[1]

A thought which seems to follow naturally from all this is the duty of the State to aid our efforts, and its neglect of that duty hitherto. There is neither need nor time to reply to the silly thought of those who insist that the State has no duty in the matter,—that it is the business of religion only, or of education, or of an enlightened public opinion. Fr. Mathew thought otherwise; for at the end of his career he hailed with delight the formation of the U. K. Alliance. Cardinal Manning thinks otherwise; for he declared[2] that the moral and religious labors of us all will not suffice to save men from drunkenness, while the Legislature studiously, year by year, multiplies profusely the temptations to drink."[3]

[1] "Cost of our Drinking Customs:"—Paper read before Manchester Statistical Society, April 9th, 1889.

[2] Speech at City Hall, Glasgow, Sept. 24, 1872.

[3] Our own Legislature here in Ireland, indeed, has been very busy for long, on the subject; but its efforts were directed, almost exclusively, to passing and amending licensing acts. Much may be said on this head, but we prefer to add here a word on our executive, which in this matter has proved itself entirely worthy of the Legisla-

The Centenary of Fr. Mathew has given occasion to examine and criticise his methods, and to compare them with those of modern temperance organizations. The criticisms we refer to were those of friends, and the blame, where blame was due, belonged to others rather than the great reformer himself. His crusade, it has been said, lacked organization, and his methods were too much of the human, and too little of the supernatural kind. Enthusiasm and his own great personal influence had a large share in his work. These and such as these were the criticisms of many; and if we must admit that in them there is much truth, we must also in justice acknowledge, that in the circumstances and difficulties of the time we shall find much to say in reply. Our modern temperance associations, such as the League of the Cross at

ture. The licensing system is practically in the hands of the magistrates; and they have used the powers conferred upon them by multiplying indefinitely the number of public-houses. So ruinous has been the effect of this action, that the licensing justices, as they are called, now acknowledge their mistake; and in a memorial recently presented to the Lord Lieutenant, and signed by a large number of magistrates from all parts of Ireland, we find them stating, "that, were it not for the unlimited temptation in the excessive number of public-houses, our work as magistrates *would become a minimum*, and our work-houses, hospitals, and jails would be more than half empty." They add that under existing circumstances the "police are powerless to prevent irregularities," and then, after suggesting as a standard one public-house for 500 inhabitants in a town, they append the following extraordinary and highly curious list, to show the excess, in a few cases "taken at random."

Ennis, . . .	6,300	population, has	100	public houses; only required,		13
New Ross, . . .	5,000	"	106	"	"	10
Mill-street, . . .	1,450	"	32	"	"	3
Ennistymon, . . .	1,350	"	25	"	"	3
Miltown-Malbay, . .	1,400	"	36	"	"	3
Castleisland, . . .	800	"	51	"	"	2
Kiltemagh, . . .	900	"	25	"	"	2
Portumna, . . .	1,100	"	36	"	"	2
Macroom, . . .	3,000	"	53	"	"	6
	21,300		464			44
			44			
			420 in excess.			

home, and your C. T. A. Association in America, have in all these respects profited by the lessons of the past. In proof take the four fundamental rules of the League of the Cross: 1. That the pledge shall be total abstinence, and without limit as to time. 2. That only Catholics can be members. 3. That all members shall *live as good practical* Catholics. 4. That none but *practical Catholics* can hold any office in the League. Here we touch upon a point about which there seems considerable divergence of opinion. It is the action and duty of the priests who lead in the work of temperance. The League-rules, as approved of by Cardinal Manning, do not require absolutely that the Rev. presidents shall be total abstainers. True it is also that all are not bound to total abstinence, and that we may not coerce any one; but public opinion seems to demand that the officers in the great movement shall be found in the ranks, and not on some distant hill-top, and the laity have made it very evident that the clergy—those at least who take a prominent part in the movement—must teach by example as well as by precept, and that such teaching will be the measure of their efficiency. We have great leaders, like Cardinal Manning on our side, and Archbishop Ireland, the Fr. Mathew of America, on yours, to proclaim aloud: "I will go to my grave without tasting alcoholic drinks." We must have men of influence and position, whether lay or cleric, prepared to subscribe to the very eloquent words of that eminent specialist, Dr. Norman Kerr, "It shall ever be to me a source of grief and remorse that I had not sooner the moral courage to openly take and wear that badge of true freedom, that emblem of perfect liberty, that decoration of the most honorable order of Christian usefulness—the Total Abstinence Pledge."

The centenary of Fr. Mathew was one which must have appealed to every class of men; for it was in honor of one whose constant lesson was good-will to all men. Whoever has read the charming biography by Mr. Maguire will not have failed to observe how universal was the praise which

the great temperance reformer won. From many testimonies we select only one, not without design, as shall be seen. It is that of the eminent author of the "Irish Sketch Book." It is complimentary, of course, but with the observation "that he (Fr. Matthew) does not wear the down-cast demure look which, I know not why, certainly characterizes the chief part of the gentlemen of his profession." The remark deserves notice, because it has somehow attracted much attention, and has been often quoted. What the great novelist's ideal of clerical propriety was we have no means of determining; but if it would substitute face-staring for the modest "demure look" which it seems he everywhere found, we think his disappointment is a legitimate matter of congratulation. Elsewhere, it would appear, those of the "demure look" sought their ideals, and as the following passage contains the solution of the puzzle of Mr. Thackeray, and presumably of thousands of his readers, we quote it at length. "Sic decet omnino clericos, in sortem Domini vocatos, vitam moresque suos omnes componere, ut *habitu, gestu, incessu, sermone, aliisque omnibus rebus nil nisi grave, moderatum, ac religione plenum præ se ferant.* . . . . et eorum actiones cunctis afferant venerationem (Conc. Trid., sess. ii.). Not only here, but generally, have the Irish priesthood fared ill at the hands of English novelists and publicists. We can well understand how it was so. Coming among us with the prejudices of early education, they came in contact only with those who had nothing in common with the priests or people of Ireland. Nor can we wonder so much at the pictures of Lever and Thackeray, when we find the author of a recent notable novel, himself an Irishman, and Irish of the Irish, giving us clerical characters of which we feel bound to say that one is a libel, and the other a caricature of Ireland's priesthood. In this respect the charming work above referred to is a happy contrast. Mr. Maguire had no difficulty in finding characters more life-like than Monsignor McGrudder or Fr. Con. Sullivan. A splendid figure is Canon Collins; amiable, if somewhat rough,

is dear old friar Donovan, while of the subject of the book itself Mr. Gladstone writes, in a letter given in the preface:—

"But, so regarded and so understood, what a glorious career it was of apostolic labor and self-sacrifice! And, even apart from the whole subject of temperance, what a character have you shown us, in its simplicity, its earnestness, its deep devotion, and, above all, in that boundless love which caused him to show forth, in deed and truth, the 'beauty of holiness,' and to present to his fellow-creatures so much of the image of our Blessed Saviour! I can truly congratulate you on having known and loved him; on having been able to write of him in a spirit of such intelligent sympathy; lastly, let me presume to say, on having composed your able book, from one end of it to the other, as a true continuation of his living work, and in the very temper, as towards God and men, which he would have himself desired."

We may fittingly conclude with a thought that comes to us from your own country and shows how closely allied America is in this, moreover, with Ireland. "I am one of those," writes an American priest, "who believe that Ireland is a kind of university, giving the tone in religion and morals to English-speaking Catholics. . . . . We are concerned with intemperate habits imported from Ireland. We are wounded, and injured by habits of intemperance allowed to grow and poison the people over there." And Archbishop Ireland in his recent article:—[1]

"Total abstinence in Ireland is total abstinence across oceans and over continents. And total abstinence in Ireland is to be had for the asking. God has not created a people more docile to their spiritual leaders than the children of St. Patrick. May I dare speak across the Atlantic, and name the means, so easy and so simple, by which Ireland will be made a sober nation of the earth, and without which labors most herculean must fail? It is this: let the words of Father Mathew reverberate in the seminaries, the monasteries, and the

[1] "Father Mathew," *Catholic World.*

presbyteries of Ireland—'Here goes in the name of God!' The magic persuasiveness of Father Mathew's appeals lay in his own total abstinence pledge. In their own pledges will the priests of Ireland conquer. 'In hoc signo vinces.'"

Strange destiny, mysterious influence of this little island of ours! More than a thousand years ago its children went out to teach the nations; and when disputes arose, they looked back to Ireland, and clung tenaciously to its customs. And lo, now, in this nineteenth century, we hear a great prelate, from beyond the ocean, declaring that "total abstinence in Ireland is total abstinence across oceans and over continents." It is a touching testimony, a new motive for effort on the part of the bishops and priesthood of Ireland. May the appeal to us from our brethren in distant lands be not made in vain. May the centenary of Fr. Mathew mark a new departure in favor of Fr. Mathew's work; and may his countrymen everywhere resolve, that now at last they shall cast off forever what has been in the past the curse, and blight, and shame of their name and race.

JAMES HALPIN.

FOUARD'S LIFE OF CHRIST.

The Christ, the Son of God. A Life of Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, by the Abbé C. Fouard. Translated from the Fifth Edition with the Author's sanction, by G. F. X. Griffith. With an Introduction by Cardinal Manning. New York and London, Longmans, Green, & Co., 1891.

OUR reading public desires to study men in the light of their daily life, to learn their character from an exact picture of their ordinary actions. While the artist seeks to satisfy this craving for an exaggerated realism, he runs the risk of disfiguring his hero with the flippancy of an endless detail, instead of ennobling the detail by the grand delineation of the heroic. In sketching the life of our Saviour, this tendency presents an even greater danger than in treating

of profane subjects. The mere gift of a happy historical fancy or of pious meditation is not sufficient to picture Christ's life successfully. A cool reflective reader will often consider as an outgrowth of sentimentality, and of a passing caprice, what has pleased others most in the hour of silent prayer and has perhaps advanced them in their inner life. When Delitzseh wrote "Ein Tag in Capernaum"[1] he no doubt had a clear vision of the Galilean routine of life; but who is not shocked at his speaking of Simon's mother-in-law slamming the door in the face of Jesus and rebuking him for being late again?

The Abbé Fouard has successfully avoided all these extravagances. His picture of the Christ is exact in its detail, and still imposing in its grand completeness. The thousand human actions of the God-man stand out in clear relief, but are always surrounded by the halo of the divine. In general, the work follows the dictates of exact science and theology, but it also glows with the warmth of a personal love for Christ. The Messianic character of Jesus unfolds itself as naturally as the blossom is followed by the fruit and seed, and all the while our hearts are growing warmer with admiration and love for His sacred person. The author has indeed drunk deeply in his Gospel studies of the knowledge and love of Him who is our way, our truth and our life.

To find faults in a work like this must seem mere pedantry to any one who has carefully read it. The learned writer has assumed such a modest tone in all unsettled questions that controversy will hardly dare to assail him. What we shall have to add must, therefore, be understood as expressing rather a difference of view on disputed points than a censure of the author of the Life of Christ.—Scientifically speaking the title "the Christ" employed throughout the work, is more exact than the common appellation "Christ." But it will take long before the Catholic public fully grasps the identity of this name with Messias or Anointed, so as

[1] The Abbé Fouard gives this work in his Bibliographical List.

to speak of Jesus the Christ instead of Jesus Christ.—The statement[1] that the name Christ was in Ps. 44, (45), viii, revealed to David as that of the Saviour, must not be taken too literally. Not every one anointed bears the appellation "the Anointed," the Messias, or the Christ.—The author probably asserts too much when he tells us[2] that "the knowledge of Hebrew antiquities has become as entire and intelligible to our generation as the archæology of Greece and Rome." May the day be near when the Bible as well as the Iliad will have its Schliemann.—In explaining the words "what is it to me and to thee?"[3] the Abbé Fouard has somewhat fallen below his common standard of lucid exegesis. He says "it is of frequent use among sacred writers, sometimes to denote a lively objection, sometimes only a simple dissent." Though both may be given "with the forms of highest courtesy," neither is in keeping with our view of the perfect harmony existing between Jesus and His blessed Mother.—Where the identity of Mary of Bethany with Mary Magdalen and the sinful woman of Galilee is discussed[4] a fairer statement of the authorites for both sides of the question might be expected. If Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustin, Gregory the Great, Clement of Alexandria are cited as witnesses for the identity, it seems but fair that Origen, Theophylactus, Euthymius, Chrysostom and the ritual of the Greek Church should be mentioned as holding the contrary opinion. Though Jerome in his Prolog. in Osee holds the affirmative, in his commentary on St. Matthew's gospel he holds the negative. Ambrose[5] keeps a doubtful attitude.[6] The reference to Rabbinic legends concerning Mary Magdalen does not excite pleasant memories, if one has read them fully.—In the explanation of the genealogical tables[7] we are told

[1] Page 15, Vol. I. [2] Vol. I. p. xvi. [3] John II. 4, see Vol. I. p. 144.
[4] Vol. I. p. 289, ff. [5] Sup. Luc.
[6] Comp. Fillion, Evang. Selon. S. Luc. p. 166; Migne, Patrolt. L. at. 183 p. 889 Jansenius Gand., Comment. in Conc. c. 48.
[7] Vol. I. p. 374.

that St. Luke's text[1] "must be twisted and deprived of its natural meaning in order to make it read as if it were the descent of Mary." If Mary was an heiress, as the author supposes[2] her husband would be legally considered the son of her own father.[3] Thus viewed, the passage reads "and Jesus . . . being, as it was supposed, the Son of Joseph, who was (legally the son) of Heli. . . ." The Abbé himself having recourse to the interpretation of legal sonship by means of levirate marriages in order to reconcile the two genealogical tables, we fail to see why he should consider the above explanation as twisting the text and depriving it of its natural meaning.—In one passage[4] the temple is by a slip of the pen located on Mount Sion; another passage it gives its true site, Mount Moriah.—According to Abbé Fouard[5] "antiquity . . . always regarded the Feast (of the Jews)[6] as either the Passover, the Pentecost, or the Feast of the Tabernacles." "There can be no question of the two last named, the author continues, for . . . Jesus returned to Galilee . . . sometime after these two feasts." But why can not the Pentecost which followed upon the return of Jesus to Galilee be meant? Fouard himself identifies the Feast with the Passover after Jesus' return to Galilee, and he must have been acquainted with the opinion of those who identify it with the Pentecost of the same year.

A similar tendency of setting forth one side of a probable opinion in such a manner as to leave the reader under the impression that the other side has few or no arguments, makes itself most felt in the appendix on the Chronology of the Passion.[7] An unexperienced reader would take all the arguments given for Christ's death on the 14th day of Nisan as fully conclusive, while they really are but skilful evasions of the proofs for the contrary opinion. If the term Parasceve generally refers "*to Friday*, the eve of the Sabbath,"

[1] III. 23. [2] Vol. I. p. 29. [3] Numb. 36, 6 ff.
[4] Vol. I. p. 390. [5] Ibid. p. 360. [6] Vol. Ibid. p. 390.
[7] Joh. v. 1. [8] App. x. vol. II.

why must the Parasceve of the Pasch signify "the Friday immediately preceding the Paschal Solemnity?" May it not mean the Friday on which the Paschal Solemnity fell, as Easter-Sunday means the Sunday on which Easter falls? The Mishna always (with *one* exception) calls the day preceding the Paschal Solemnity either 'Arbaah 'Asar (the 14th) or 'Arbe Pesachim (the evenings of the Passover;) only in the late Midrash Ruth and the present Jewish calendars is the eve of the Passover called 'Arubath Pasha "and 'Ereb Pesach," which terms may be taken as equivalents for Parasceve of the Pasch. Hence this phrase favors the opinion that Jesus died on a Friday coincident with the Paschal Festivity, *i. e.*, on the 15th day of Nisan.—If St. John [1] says that the last supper took place "before the Feast," he does not necessarily imply that it occurred *a whole day* before the Feast, that in other words the last supper occurred on the evening of the 13th day, while the Feast began in the evening of the 14th. We are told that the Paschal lamb was eaten between the two evenings, *i. e.*, between second vespers of the 14th and first vespers of the 15th; hence if Our Lord observed the regular time for eating the lamb, St. John might well say that the supper occurred "before the Feast." Moreover, we know from the Jerusalem Talmud,[2] the Mishna[3] and the testimony of Relandus[4] that in reckoning *sacrificial* times, the night *followed* the day. Consequently, speaking of the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, St. John rightly placed it "before the Feast," since in sacrificial language the Feast began only the following morning.

The other passages of St. John's Gospel which the Abbé Fouard cites for his own opinion, are no less in favor of the opposite view. Why should the Apostles believe that Judas left their company[5] to buy what was requisite for the Feast, if a full day intervened between the last supper and

[1] 13, 1. [2] Joma xxxviii. 2.
[3] Berakhoth I. 1; Menachoth xi. 9; Chullin V. 5; liii. 1.
[4] Antig. Sacr. iv. 1. 15 [5] John xiii. 29.

the Feast? Why should the Jews be anxious to avoid contamination that they might eat the Pasch [1] if by Pasch they meant the Paschal lamb eaten after sunset at which hour the contamination would have ceased? They evidently must refer to the Chagigah, eaten before the end of the day and before the time for contamination would cease.[2] The "Great Sabbath" [3] was the name of the Sabbath within the Passover week. It should seem, therefore, that the fourth Gospel points rather to the 15th than to the 14th day of Nisan as the day of the crucifixion.

In his arguments from the synoptic Gospels the Abbé Fouard is less emphatic; he seems to feel himself that they are too explicit in indicating the 14th day of Nisan as that of the Last Supper, and the 15th as that of the crucifixion. According to St. Matthew [4] the disciples ask, "where wilt Thou that we prepare for Thee to eat *the Pasch?* . . . and they prepared *the Pasch.*" St. Mark [5] is equally clear: "whither wilt Thou that we go, and prepare for Thee to eat *the Pasch?* . . . and they prepared *the Pasch.*" St. Luke agrees with the other Evangelists [6] "Go, and prepare for us *the Pasch,* . . . . where I may eat *the Pasch* . . . . and they . . . made ready *the Pasch* . . . . With desire have I desired to eat *this Pasch* with you before I suffer." Now *the Pasch* was eaten on the 14th day of Nisan. [7] Consequently Jesus ate the Pasch, the Last Supper, on the 14th, and died on the 15th day of Nisan.

Calmet denies in the face of the above Gospel-testimony, that Jesus ate the *legal* Pasch. The author of "The Christ" prefers Sepp's opinion, according to which the *Paschal Lamb* was not eaten by Jesus and the Apostles at the Last Supper, all the other ceremonies being religiously observed. But we must remember that the Paschal lamb constituted the principal element of the Pasch. How then can we suppose

[1] John xviii. 28. [2] Cf. Pesach ix. 5. [3] John xix. 31.
[4] xxvi. 17 ff [5] xiv. 12 ff. [6] xxii. 8 ff.
[7] Comp. Exod. xii. 6, 16, 18. Deut. xvi. 1, 6. Joseph. Antiq. iii. x. 5.

that three Evangelists, without giving a word of explanation, repeatedly assert that Jesus ate the Pasch, if its principal element was wanting, and if the supper happened at an illegal time, on the 13th day of Nisan? The synoptic Gospels are almost explicit in asserting the contrary. St. Luke[1] says that the supper happened on "the day of the unleavened bread, on which it *was necessary* that the Pasch should be killed." The above texts from Exod., Deut., and Joseph., show that it was necessary that the Pasch should be killed on the 14th day of Nisan.—Again Lightfoot,[2] and Josephus[3] tell us that the vigil of the solemn Passover was the first day of the unleavened bread, or of the azymes. Now the synoptic Gospels agree in placing the Last Supper on the first day of the unleavened bread.[4] Consequently, the synoptic Gospels agree with the fourth Gospel in placing the Last Supper on the 14th, the crucifixion on the 15th day of Nisan.

Nor is the Abbê Fouard's argument from tradition of any more value. Apollinaris, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Peter of Alexandria are cited[5] as witnesses for Christ's crucifixion on the 14th day of Nisan. But it might have been added that Apollinaris[6] testifies clearly for the tradition favoring the opposite opinion. Several of the above witnesses[7] rather reason "a priori" on the time of Christ's death, than give testimony of existing traditions on the subject. They proceed from the erroneous principle that Christ must have died, when the Paschal Lamb was slain, and they seem to forget that the institution of the Holy Eucharist contained as true a sacrifice as was offered on Mount Calvary. But besides all this, we have a number of early Fathers who are explicit in stating that Jesus ate the Paschal Lamb according to the Jewish rite,

[1] xxii. 7. [2] Minist. Templ. xii. 11. [3] Antiq. II. xv. 1.
[4] Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 7. [5] Vol. II. p. 390. ff.
[6] Chronic. paschale, Ed. Dind. tom. I. p. 13.
[7] Apoll. Clement of Alex., Hippol etc.

and therefore on the 14th day of Nisan. Not to speak of Latin Fathers, we simply refer to Justinus [1] Irenæus [2] Origen, [3] Apost. constit. [4] an anonymous writer,[5] Epiphanius. [6] Even the rationalistic Tubingen school takes the fact that tradition favors the 15th day of Nisan as the day of crucifixion for so evident that it starts from it as a first principle in one of its arguments against the authenticity of the fourth Gospel. "Tradition, they say, coming down from SS. John and Philip assigns the 15th day of Nisan as the date of Christ's crucifixion; the fourth Gospel fixes it on the fourteenth. Consequently St. John cannot be its author." Having already shown the second statement to be false, we may here content ourselves with expressing our satisfaction that the Gospels and tradition are so well in unison on the probable date of our Lord's death.

Finally a word about the "movement and stir inexplicable if occurring in the very midst of the sacred repose of the Paschal Feast." [7] If we analyze this "movement and stir" we find that it contains four elements: the trial, the flagellation, the crucifixion and the burial of Jesus. We shall not insist on the fact that the flagellation, the crucifixion and the greater part of the trial were performed by Gentiles, not bound by Jewish Law; nor shall we repeat what has been proved above that sacrificial feasts were counted from morning to morning, while the Jewish part of the trial of Jesus took place during the night; but we shall fairly consider the elements one by one in the light of the Jewish Law. As to the trial, the Abbê Fouard himself confesses.[8] "It is true that no law interdicted the administration of justice on Feast days." The same is inferred from the Mishna Jom Tob (v. 2.) and Shabbath (1 ff.). Regarding flagellation the Jerusalem Talmud [9] states; "Flagellation may take place

[1] Troypho III. Mign. Patrol. Gr. 6. 731. [2] Adv. hær. 2. 22, 3; M. Pat. Graec 7, 783.
[3] In Matt. xxvi. 17; Patrol. Graec. 13, 1728. [4] 5, 15, Patrol. Graec. 1, 883.
[5] Spicileg. Solesm. i. 10. [6] Hær. 30. Pat. Graec. 41, 442.
[7] Vol. II. p. 389. [8] Vol. II. p. 389. [9] Betza v. 2.

on a festival day, but not on the Sabbath." As to the execution, St. Matthew tells us,[1] that the Jews had decided not to kill Jesus on the festival day, *lest a tumult should arise* among the people. Consequently it must have been lawful to kill condemned criminals on the festival day. Moreover, the Mishna,[2] gives a decree that a certain class of criminals —offenders against legal traditions,—should suffer their punishment on a festival day. Jesus was manifestly considered as belonging to this class, Concerning burial, the general law prescribes[3] for a person being deceased on the Sabbath let everything necessary be done, provided he be not moved from the place where he died. Executed criminals, however, not only could be buried on a festival day, but they must be buried according to the Mekilta Nezikin (4) and the law of Deuteronomy.[4]

It must be confessed, however, that this characteristic of the Abbé Fouard's Life of the Christ, simply stating the arguments for but one side of a disputed question gives the book, in other respects a superior interest and attraction. Too much precision in the statement of facts, as to their scientific value, and of contrary views is apt to weary the unscientific reader. In several instances we should have been sorry indeed, had a more scientific method been adopted. And if the author's manner of writing attracts but one heart more to that of his Saviour than a more learned way would do, he is amply justified in having adopted it, in spite of all the disputes of learned men.

The high literary authority under whose patronage the translation of the Christ has been made, insures its faithfulness, and unexceptional excellency. Unless our judgment be biassed by an acquaintance with the French editions, the English translation lacks a little of the original crispness of style; some of the metaphors, too, have been altered in the translation, or they have not been sustained with sufficient

[1] xxvi 5. [2] Sanhedrin x. 3, 4. [3] Mishna, shabb. xxiii. 5. [4] xxi. 2, 3.

effect. But these sacrifices of style, are usually more than compensated for by an unwonted clearness of expression.

A. J. Maas, S. J.

TITULARS IN MARCH.

I. ST. CASIMIR.

Mart. 4, Dupl. 1. cl. sine octava propter quadrages. *Pro Clero Romano* idem, et fest S. Lucii perpet. mutatur in diem seq.

II. ST. THOMAS AQUINAS.

Mart. 7, Dupl. 1. cl. sine oct. *Pro Clero Romano* idem.

III. ST. JOHN OF GOD.

Mart. 8, Domin. Fit de Titulari. Dupl. 1. cl. sine oct. Com. Domin. *Pro Clero Romano* idem.

IV. ST. FRANCES OF ROME.

Mart. 9, Dupl. 1. cl. sine oct. *Pro Clero Romano* idem.

V. FORTY HOLY MARTYRS.

Mart. 10, Dupl. 1. cl. sine oct. *Pro Clero Romano* idem.

VI. ST. GREGORY THE GREAT.

Mart. 12, Dupl. 1. cl. sine oct. *Pro Clero Romano* idem.

VII. ST. PATRICK.

Mart. 17, Dupl. 1. cl. sine oct. *Pro Clero Romano* idem.

VIII. ST. GABRIEL, ARCHANGEL.

Mart. 18, Dupl. 1. cl. sine oct. *Pro Clero Romano* idem.

IX. ST. JOSEPH.

Mart. 19, Dupl. 1. cl. ut in Calend. sine oct. *Pro Clero Romano* idem.

X. THE SEVEN DOLORS.

Mart. 20, Ubi ex speciali privilegio festum hoc ut Tituli celebratur in Quadrag. Dupl. 1. cl. sine oct. Alioquin celebrand. mense Sept.

XI. ST. BENEDICT, ABBOT.

Mart 21, Dupl. 1. cl. sine oct. *Pro Clero Romano* idem.

XII. ANNUNCIATION OF THE B. V. M.

Mart. 25, Hoc anno propter habdomad. sanctam transferend. in 6. April. ubi celebrabitur ut indicatum in Calendar. sine octava *Pro Clero Romano* idem.

XIII. ST. RUPERTUS.

Mart. 26, Hoc anno transferend. sine octava in 7. Aprilis et fest. S. Cyrilli inde movend. in 8. April fest. vero S. Isidori celebrand. 9. April *Pro Clero Romano* S. Rupertus Titularis celebrabitur etiam 7. Apr. ut dupl. 1. cl. sine octava cum translatione S. Cœlestini in 10. April.

H. GABRIELS.

CONFERENCE.

Error in the American Ordos.

Qu. On the 19th of January Pustet's Ordo had the feast of St. Canute, *semid.* The Baltimore Ordo gave the feast of Cathedra Petri [transferred from Sunday]—which is right; and why? As the office of St. Canute is not, like that of St. Remigius, [1st of October] a *semiduplex ad libitum vel simplex de præcepto*, but merely a *semiduplex ad libitum* [that is to say, it may be celebrated or not; but if it is celebrated it ranks invariably as a *semiduplex*], it would seem that the day occupied by it cannot properly be called a *dies impedita*, and that if its place is demanded by some transferred office, that of St. Canute must give way.

Again: There are three Ordos published, "Pro Clero Statuum Fœderatorum Americæ."[1] Now, who is to decide whether or not an office *ad libitum*, like that of St. Canute, is to be inserted in the Ordo? If it be said that the bishops of the country leave the matter to the editors of the Ordos, would it not be advisable for those gentlemen to consult with one another in a doubtful case like the above, and to come to an agreement before their respective Calendars are published?

[1] At Baltimore, Lucas; New York and Cincinnati, Pustet; and St. Louis, Herder.

Resp. Referring to a decision of the S. R. C. dated Feb. 16th, 1669,[1] De Herdt appears to conclude that a feast *ad libitum*, such as that of St. Canute, is either a *dies impedita* or a *dies libera*, which latter would admit a transferred feast, like that of Cathedra Petri, according to the preference of the cleric who recites the office. "Impedimentum esse ad libitum; *impedire* enim, si amat officium festi ad libitum recitare, *non impedire* si ab eo abstinendum censet."

According to this, both the Baltimore and New York Ordos were at fault this year; the former, in giving absolutely the feast of Cathedra Petri as transferred; the other, in placing St. Canute on the 19th of January without indicating that there was a free choice, which should have been left to the cleric and not determined by the compiler of the Ordo.

There are other disagreements between the Ordos: *v. gr.* in regard to the obligation of the votive offices on Thursdays and Saturdays outside of the seasons of Advent and Lent. It would certainly be desirable, as our correspondent suggests, that the compilers of the Ordos should come to some understanding which would bring about uniformity in the offices of the churches in the United States.

The League of the Cross.

The Pastoral Letter recently addressed by the Bishop of Antigonish (N. S.) to his clergy on the subject of temperance has attracted wide notice outside of that diocese. As the Bishop urges priests, and especially the pastors of his flock, to enroll their people under the banner of the "League of the Cross," which association enjoys special blessings granted by the Vicar of Christ to its members, we answer the various queries of American priests as to the character of that society, by giving below a sketch of the principles and rules of the League as published some time ago in England by order of Cardinal Manning.

There is every evidence that a temperance society, in

[1] Praxis, Vol. II., n. 284.

which the Catholic principle of Christian self-denial and respect for the ordinances of the Church are not dominant features, becomes a prey to fanatic leaders and self-opinionated demagogues who establish a tyranny worse than that of drink.

Origin, Principles, and Necessity of the League of the Cross.

1. The Catholic Total Abstinence League of the Cross was founded in 1873, for the purpose of uniting Catholics, both clergy and laity, in a holy warfare against intemperance, and of thereby raising the religious, social, and domestic state of our Catholic people, especially of the working classes.

2. Total abstinence from intoxicating drinks is for all persons the surest safeguard, and for vast numbers of persons it is the *only* safeguard against intemperance. Those, therefore, who abstain from intoxicating drinks for the sake of Christian prudence towards themselves, or of Christian charity towards others, by so doing please Almighty God.

3. The need of this prudence and charity is seen in the great injury done to nations, to society, to families, and to the souls and bodies of men, women, and children, by the abuse of intoxicating drinks; it has been recognized by the Holy See in granting indulgences to the League of the Cross; and it is shown by the earnestness with which the League has been established and extended in Great Britain and Ireland and elsewhere.

Fundamental Rules of the League.

1. The pledge is of total abstinence, and is taken without limit as to time.

2. Only Catholics can become members of the League.

3. All members, after they have joined the League, must live as good practical Catholics.

4. No one who is not a practical Catholic can, as long as he fails to practice his religion, hold any office in the League.

The members are exhorted to go to Confession and Holy Communion at least once a month.

Organization of the League.

1. Wherever the League is established by the authority of the Ordinary, the indulgences may be gained; and if the four fundamental rules are observed, a branch may have whatever organization and other rules are found most suitable.

2. Persons at a distance from any branch may become members of the League by taking its pledge and sending their names to any place where the League is established.

League Guild for Children.

In many branches a League of the Cross Guild is established for children. The members are enrolled in the League with their parents' consent; and they have their Guild meetings, with special devotions.

Resolutions.

The following temperance resolutions are read in the churches of all dioceses of England on the *first Sunday of every month:*

The wide-spread habit of intemperance is the prolific cause of a multitude of evils which afflict this country. It degrades and destroys the body and soul of innumerable Christians, and is perpetually offering before the throne of God most heinous offences against His Divine Majesty.

Wherefore, the Cardinal Archbishop and Bishops of England have determind to invite the whole of their flock to unite with them in an earnest and persevering endeavor to stem the tide of these evils and to offer becoming acts of reparation to the offended Majesty of God.

All here present are therefore *invited* to make *one or the other of the following resolutions,* according to their *discretion,* namely:

1. To offer up Mass and Benediction this day for the suppression of drunkenness, the preservation of those who have taken a pledge, and for the spread of the virtue of temperance.

2. To say the Rosary once a week for the above intentions.

3. To practice habitually some specific act of mortification in the matter of drink, under the direction or approval of a confessor.

4. Never to taste intoxicating drink in a public house.

5. Never to take intoxicating drink out of a meal time.

6. To abstain from intoxicating drink on Friday and Saturday in honor of the Passion of Jesus and the Sorrow of Mary.

7. To abstain absolutely from the use of ardent spirits.

8. To take the total abstinence pledge for a year.

9. To take the total abstinence pledge for life.

The priest may here read the following words, which the people can repeat after him either aloud or to themselves:

"I firmly purpose, by God's help, to keep the resolution which I have made to His honor and glory, in reparation for sins of intemperance, and in promotion of the salvation of souls. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

ANALECTA.

EX S. CONGR. S. R. U. INQUISITIONIS.

Instructio De Status Libertate ante Nuptias probanda.

This Instruction was principally intended for and sent to the Bishops of the Oriental Church, but its application in many cases to the conditions of the Church in the United States must be apparent at first sight.

Ut sua christifidelium nuptiis stet unitas, utque in iis contrahendis nullitas vitetur, Suprema Congregatio Eminentissimorum Patrum una mecum Generalium Inquisitorum, auctorante SSmo D. N. Leone XIII, sequentem instructionem exarandam et cum Episcopis Orientalibus communicandam mandavit, quæ inter difficultates, quibus undique

premuntur, magno illis usui et adjumento foret ad probandam status libertatem eorum, qui matrimonio jungi desiderant.

1. Status libertas triplici via detegi et juridice probari potest; *a.* publicationibus in Ecclesia faciendis; *b.* documentis; *c.* examine testium.

2. Publicationes faciendæ sunt in loco domicilii vel quasi domicilii. Expedit etiam ut fiant in loco originis, si contrahentes ibi morati fuerint post adeptam ætatem ad matrimonium contrahendum idoneam; atque insuper in locis ubi saltem per decem menses commorati fuerint, nisi jam a pluribus annis domicilium fixerint in loco, ubi matrimonium contrahendum est.

3. Testium examini si in civitate episcopali fiat, præsit Vicarius generalis, si in aliis locis Diœcesis, parochus. Interrogationes vero, et responsiones scripto diligenter mandentur præmisso singulorum testium juramento de veritate dicenda.

4. Ad testimonium ferendum in hac materia etiam feminæ possunt admitti, et recipiuntur magis consanguinei, nempe parentes, fratres, sorores, etc., quam externi, quia præsumuntur melius informati; et cives magis quam exteri.

5. Fides, aliaque documenta quæ a partibus, vel de partibus producuntur, munita sint sigillo non parochi tantum, sed potissimum Ordinarii illius Diœcesis, unde manarunt. Semper autem attente providendum erit, ut fides, seu testimonia bene et concludenter identificent personas de quibus agitur.

6. Si post probatam status libertatem duo aut tres menses transierint, quin matrimonium fuerit celebratum, regulariter novus processus pro hoc temporis spatio fieri deberet; ast pro casuum varietate res relinquitur prudenti arbitrio Ordinariorum.

7. Si quis ex contrahentibus fuerit in articulo mortis, intra quem probabiliter tempus non suppetat instituendi diligentias necessarias, processus præscriptus poterit omitti, ita tamen, ut si infirmus convaluerit, debeant fieri diligentiæ, seu processus antequam simul conveniant.

8. Si contrahentes sint vagi, non concedatur licentia contrahendi, nisi doceant per documenta Ordinariorum suorum se esse liberos; quod si fides singulorum Ordinariorum, in quorum diœcesibus per aliquod temporis spatium, annum non excedens, commorati sunt, haberi non possit, Ordinarius loci in quo matrimonium est contrahendum, eos ad juramentum suppletorium admittere poterit, pro illis tantum locis, ex quibus fides authentica haberi non poterit. Insisten-

dum tamen erit semper ut contrahentes inducant testes fide dignos in respectivis locis examinandos. Si tamen id difficulter admodum fieri possit, admitti poterunt in Curia loci ubi contrahitur matrimonium testes fide digni qui status libertatem tempore vagationis concludenter probant; et si Ordinario opportunum videatur, admitti etiam poterit sponsus ad juramentum suppletorium, constito tamen sibi ipsum esse fide dignum.

9. Quodsi dubium circa status libertatem contrahentium oriatur vel ex matrimonio, catholico modo, a catholicis celebrato; vel ex connubio ab hæreticis aut schismaticis juxta diversarum sectarum statuta contracto, et postea per sententiam talium tribunalium dissoluto; aut ex contracto inter infideles, qui postea recissus, aut nullus declaratus fuerit, standum Instructioni hujus Supremæ Congregationis Sanctæ Romanæ et Universalis Inquisitionis datæ die 20 Septembris 1883, art. 4. (Cf. Conc. Plen. Balt. III App. pag. 274.)

10. Testis examinandus moneatur de gravitate juramenti in hoc negotio ferendi, ac deinde interrogetur de nomine, cognomine, patre, patria, ætate, conditione, et habitatione, tum, an sit civis vel exterus; et quatenus exterus, a quo tempore sit in loco, in quo deponit. An ad examen accesserit sponte vel requisitus. Si dicat se accessisse sponte a nemine requisitum, dimittatur, quia præsumitur mendax; si requisitum, interrogetur a quo, vel a quibus, ubi, quando, quomodo, coram quibus, et quoties fuerit requisitus, et an sciat adesse aliquod impedimentum inter contrahere volentes. An sibi pro hoc testimonio ferendo fuerit aliquid datum, promissum, remissum, vel oblatum a contrahere volentibus, vel ab alio eorum nomine. An cognoscat contrahere volentes, ipsorum indolem, mores, conditionem, et a quo tempore, in quo loco, qua occasione. Si responderit negative, testis dimittatur, si vero affirmative, interrogetur, an iidem sint cives, vel exteri. Si responderit esse exteros, supersedeatur in licentia contrahendi, donec per litteras Ordinarii ipsorum doceatur de eorum libero statu, pro eo tempore quo in ejus diœcesi morati sunt.

11. Ad probandum vero eorundem statum liberum pro tempore reliquo, scilicet usque ad tempus, quo volunt contrahere, admitti poterunt testes idonei, qui si concludenter probent rationem reddendo propriæ scientiæ, necesse non erit deferre attestationes Ordinariorum locorum, in quibus contracturi moram duxerint. Si vero responderint eos esse cives, interrogentur sub qua parochia hactenus habitaverint vel

habitent, an sciant alterutrum vel utrumque quandoque matrimonio copulatum fuisse, aut professum in aliqua religione approbata, vel suscepisse aliquem ex ordinibus, cui adnexa sit lex cælibatus, vel alio impedimento matrimonium dirimente esse obstrictum. Si ad hæc negative responderint, interrogentur de causa scientiæ, et an sit saltem possibile ut alteruter habuerit uxorem, vel maritum, aut aliud impedimentum, quod ab ipsis testibus ignoretur. Si responderint affirmative, supersedeatur, nisi ex aliis testibus contrarium concludenter probetur. Si vero responderint negative, interrogentur de causa scientiæ, ex qua deinde colligere poterit, an hujusmodi testibus fides sit adhibenda. Si responderint nupturientes habuisse uxorem vel maritum, sed esse mortuos, interrogentur de loco et tempore, quo sunt mortui, et quomodo et unde sciunt eos fuisse conjunctos et respectivam eorum uxorem vel maritum esse mortuos. Si respondeant mortuos esse in aliquo hospitali, vel se vidisse eos sepeliri in aliqua certa ecclesia aut cœmeterio, non detur licentia contrahendi, nisi prius recepto testimonio authentico a rectore hospitalis, in quo prædicti decesserunt, vel a rectore ecclesiæ aut cœmeterii, in quo humata fuerunt eorum cadavera. Si tamen hujusmodi testimonia haberi non possunt, non excluduntur aliæ probationes, quæ de jure communi possunt admitti, dummodo sint legitimæ et sufficientes. Interrogentur insuper, an post mortem alterutrius conjugis ad secunda vota transierint; et quatenus negative, an fieri potuerit, ut aliquis ex illis transierit ad secunda vota, quæ ab ipsis testibus ignorentur; et quatenus affirmative supersedeatur a licentia, donec producantur testes, per quos negativa coarctetur concludenter. Si vero negative, interrogentur de causa scientiæ, qua perpensa, judex poterit judicare an sit concedenda licentia, necne.

Datum Romæ, die 29 *Augusti an. D.* 1890

R. Card. Monaco.

BOOK REVIEW.

MISCELLANY, Historical Sketch of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. Rules and Constitutions of the Congregation of the M. H. R. Instructions about the Religious State. Lives of two Fathers and of a Lay Brother, C. SS. R. Discourses on Calamities. Reflections useful for Bishops. Rules for Seminaries. By St. Alphonsus de Liguori, Doctor of the Church. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C. SS. R.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros., 890.

The last volume of the Centenary edition, excepting the Collection of Letters which is still to follow, is not by any means the least in the important series placed before the English reader through the intelligent zeal of Father Grimm. In some respects we have here St. Alphonsus revealing his inmost self. The Constitutions and Rules of the Order which he founded, the counsels which he gives to those who would embrace the religious life, the exhortations to the young novices--all these combined represent the mental framework animated by the vivifying charity of the saint. We see him as he constructs and plans with scales of infinite accuracy; we see him select the material, piece by piece, with a trained eye and careful hand ; how he guides and directs the different faculties which are to coöperate in raising that grand edifice of religious perfection which is to touch the very heavens—yet without confusion of tongue or mind, because it is done not in pride but in humility.--We do not know whether the original which the present editor followed observed the same order of subjects, but it was a happy thought so to group the material of the Miscellany as to bring the Lives of Father's Cafaro and Sarnelli, and of that pure soul, Brother Vitius Curzius, immediately after the treatise on the Religious State.

We pass over the discourses and those healthy reflections on the duties of the episcopate which the Saint had the courage to send to the bishops of Italy, notwithstanding the fact that he was a simple priest and had written very little to make him known. The earnest tone, the unquestionable truthfulness of his words, however, made a deep impression, and we have still on record the reverential acknowledgment with which the bishops received these reflections from the Saint. The rules for seminaries are already well known, although they can never be pondered sufficiently, especially at this time, when there is occasional proof of misunderstanding as to the value of discipline in preserving a true spirit of liberty.

Apart from so much that is useful in this volume as furthering a truly ascetical life, it contains in its concluding portion a very practical treatment of the social question. We only need change the names and make the application. St. Alphonsus knew men. He also grasped the fundamental principles of government, and with this double knowledge every problem of society and state may be solved if there be a man strong enough to lead in the movement which is to shape or rather to inform itself by these principles. To rule by the will of the masses may mean

two things and two opposite things, which represent freedom with loyalty or serfdom with anarachy. To save ourselves from the latter, we must be imbued and fill our people with the principles laid down by the holy Doctor Alphonsus.

THE YOUNG MAN IN CATHOLIC LIFE. By Condé B.Pallen, Ph. D.—St. Louis: B. Herder. 1891.

The purpose and spirit of this pamphlet is excellent. Our young men are rendered conscious in a practical way of the duty they owe to themselves and to society. This duty demands of them first of all a sensible knowledge of their faith and the facts which support it, so as to enable them to give a reason for their being Catholics, and thus to draw others to the recognition of truth. The language in which Mr. Pallen clothes his thoughts is often highly poetical and quite apt to attract. We gladly recommend it.—But who says that Galileo was burnt for holding that the earth moves? (pag. 16).

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The mention of books under this head does not preclude further notice of them in subsequent numbers.

IPSE, IPSA: IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM: WHICH? [The Latin various readings, Genesis III, 15]. Controversial letters in answer to the above question, and in vindication of the position assigned by the Catholic Church to the ever Blessed Mother of the world's Redeemer in the divine economy of man's salvation.—In reply to the Rt. Rev. Dr. Kingdon, coadjutor-bishop (Anglican) of Fredericton, N. B., and "John M. Davenport, Priest of the Mission Church," Ritualist Minister, St. John, New Brunswick.—By Richard F. Quigley, LL. B., [Harvard and Boston Universities] etc. Fr. Pustet & Co. New York and Cincinnati.

A NOVENA IN HONOR OF ST. CATHARINE DE RICCI, a Religious of the Third Order of St. Dominic. Drawn from devotions used in the monastery where the saint lived and from other sources. By the Dominican Sisters, Albany, N. Y. With a preface by Rev. J. O'Neil, O. P.—New York, Cincinn., Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1891.

THE HEART OF ST. JANE FRANCES DE CHANTAL. Thoughts and Prayers compiled from the French by the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. With a preface by the Rt. Rev. Thomas Preston, D. D. —New York, Cincinn., Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1891.

SKETCH OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. By Rev. D. A. Merrick, S. J.—New York, Cincinn., Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1891.

COMMENTARIUS IN DANIELEM PROPHETAM. Lamentationes et Baruch. Auctore Jos. Knabenbauer, S. J. (Cursus Scripturæ Sacræ auctoribus R. Cornely, J. Knabenbauer, Fr. de Hummelauer aliisque Soc. Jesu presbyteris) - Parisiis: Sumptibus P. Lethielleux, edit. 1891.

AN ORDER OF DIVINE PRAISE AND PRAYER for Congregational use in Churches.—New York: Office of the "Catholic World." 1891.

DIE PRIESTERWEIHE und ihre vorbereitenden hl. Weihen, nach der Lehre und Liturgie d. Kath. Kirche. Von Dr. Otto Zardetti, Bischof v. St. Cloud, Minn.—New York, Cincinn., Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

ST. JOSEPH. Short meditations for March. By Richard F. Clarke, S. J.—New York, Cincin., and Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1891.

MANUAL OF INDULGENCED PRAYERS. A complete Prayer book, arranged and disposed for daily use by Rev. Bonaventure Hammer. O. S. F.—New York, Cincin. and Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

MISSION WORK AMONG THE NEGROES AND INDIANS. What is being accomplished by means of the Annual Collection taken up for our Missions.—Baltimore: Foley Bros. 1891.

OFFICIA NOVISSIMA A SS. D. N. Leone XIII per Decretum S. R. C. sub die 19 Augusti 1890. Ecclesiæ universæ concessa.—Ratisbonæ, Neo Eboraci et Cincin: Fr. Pustet. 1891.

MISSA (Fol.) S. JOANNIS DAMASCENI Conf. et eccl Doct. Fr. Pustet. 1891.

LETTERS OE ST. ALPHONSUS Maria de Ligouri. Eighteenth volume of the Centenary edition of the works of St. Alphonsus.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1891.

CHRISTIAN ART IN OUR OWN AGE. By Eliza Allen Starr.—Notre Dame, Indiana: Office of the Ave Maria. 1891.

MISSA DE NATIVITATE DOMINI, including Gradual and Offertory for Christmas, for two voices, Soprano and Alto, with organ accompaniment. Composed by Bruno Oscar Klein.—New York: J. Fischer & Bro. 1890.

SUMMA APOLOGETICA de Ecclesia Catholica, ad mentem S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Auctore Fr. J. V. De Groot, Ord. Præd., S. Theol. Lect.—Ratisbonæ: Inst. Libr. pridem G. J. Manz. 1890. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS juxta doctrinam S. Alphonsi de Ligorio, Doctoris Ecclesiæ. Auctore Josepho Aertnys, C. SS. R. Editio altera, aucta et recognita Tom. 1 and 2.

SUPPLEMENTUM AD TRACTATUM de Septimo Decalogi præcepto secundum Jus Civile Gallicum. Paderbornæ, Ferdinand Schœningh, 1890. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York & Cincinnati.

Weston Jesuit School of Theology
3 0135 00286 5242